LS Dec 2 '91

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY

GIFT OF THE

GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

US Doc 2.791

Committee on Un-American Activities
House
86th Congress

Table of Contents

(Since these hearings are consecutively paged they are arranged by page number, instead of alphabetically by title)

1. American National Exhibition, Moscow, July 1959 3140

2. Communist Training Operations. pt.1 314

3. Testimony of Clinton Edward Jencks 3142

4. Testimony of Arnold Johnson, Legislative Director of the Communist Party, U.S.A. 3143

5-7. Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. pt.1-3 3144

8. Issues Presented by Air Reserve Center Training Manual 3145

9-10. Communist Training Operations. pt. 2-3

11-12. Communist Activities Among Puerto Ricans in New York City and Puerto Rico. pt.1-2 3146

4280
33-3

7 US Doc 2.791

WESTERN SECTION OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

OCTOBER 22, 1959

PART 3

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INCLUDING INDEX)

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
MAY 23 1960

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1960

48192

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri
CLYDE DOYLE, California
EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana
WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia

DONALD L. JACKSON, California
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio
WILLIAM E. MILLER, New York
AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan

RICHARD ARENS, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

PART 1

Page

Synopsis VI
October 20, 1959: Testimony of—
Daniel Francis Cohen 1118
Aaron K. Cohen 1125
Daniel Bessie 1127
Moiselle (J.) Clinger 1133
Afternoon session:
Moiselle (J.) Clinger (resumed) 1137
William Rubin 1155
Ralph Hall 1158
Adele Allen 1162
Dr. Murray (Julius) Goldberg 1162
Gilbert Drummond 1166
Adele Allen (resumed) 1168

PART 2

Synopsis. (*See* Part 1, p. VI.)
October 21, 1959: Testimony of—
Robert Duff Brent 1171
Harriet Blumenkranz 1174
Lona Wells 1177
Milton Kagan 1179
Joe Sniderman 1181
Paul Geiselman, Jr 1182
John (F.) Kranen 1187
Afternoon session:
Marion Miller 1189
Phyllis Lebow 1214
Eleanor Maas 1219
Donald Ornitz 1221
Eleanor Maas (resumed) 1223

PART 3

Synopsis. (*See* Part 1, p. VI.)
October 22, 1959: Testimony of—
A. L. Wirin (Statement) 1227
Harper (W.) Poulson 1229
Afternoon session:
James George McGowan 1250
William Wallace Norton, Jr 1253
Mark Eugene Sink 1261
Jack Burstein 1263
Adele Kronick Silva 1264
Index i

UBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * *

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

(q)(1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * * * *

RULE XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 7, January 7, 1959

* * * * * * *

Rule X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * * * *

Rule XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * * * *

26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

WESTERN SECTION OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Part 3

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1959

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in Courtroom No. 1, United States Post Office and Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Subcommittee members present: Hon. Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, and Hon. Donald L. Jackson, of California.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel, and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. MOULDER. The subcommittee will be in order.

This morning the subcommittee received the following telegram from Mr. Wirin, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union. The telegram reads as follows:

> Pursuant rules your committee and statement at opening of Los Angeles hearings that any person named in course committee hearings be given early opportunity appear to deny or explain adverse testimony, I desire appear briefly in behalf American Civil Liberties Union with respect testimony of Marion Miller mentioning American Civil Liberties Union.
>
> A. L. WIRIN, *Counsel.*

In accordance with the rules and the practice of the committee, Mr. Wirin, would you care to come forward as a witness and be sworn?

Mr. WIRIN. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WIRIN. I do.

STATEMENT OF A. L. WIRIN

Mr. WIRIN. Mr. Chairman, you don't want to interrogate me. May I state our position?

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. WIRIN. I was present yesterday when Mrs. Miller gave her testimony, and I shall make no comment on any of the testimony except that portion which referred to the American Civil Liberties Union.

As I recall her testimony, it was to the effect that there had been vandalism at her home in opposition to a position she had taken, and that her husband had communicated with the American Civil Liberties Union seeking help and didn't receive it.

Subsequent to the hearing I checked in my own office. I am counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California. And I checked with the officials at the office, the main office of the American Civil Liberties Union.

First, there is no record of any kind at the office of the American Civil Liberties Union in, in contradistinction to mine, of any claim made by any person with respect to alleged vandalism at the home of the Millers.

Moreover, if such a claim were made, it would come to my attention, as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union. I have been counsel for more years than I need now mention; in any event, for a period longer than the Millers' testimony, and not only do I recall no complaint or claim of vandalism at their home, but I am confident that no such claim came to my attention; and, finally, had such a claim come to my attention, as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, or to the American Civil Liberties Union, it would have been treated exactly as any claim of vandalism, of vigilantism against any person; it would have been thoroughly investigated, and a protest would have been made with respect to such vandalism, whether or not we disagreed with the views of the person who was involved, and we would have either made a public protest, or, if the facts warranted, filed civil suit for damages, a procedure with which this committee is not completely unacquainted.

So, insofar as the American Civil Liberties Union is concerned, we draw no distinction with respect to any person. If any person's rights, no matter his race or his opinion, are violated, we take exactly the same action, and we would have in this instance, although, needless to say, many of us personally do not share the view as to the role of informants and as to their value that others in this room have, but that is entirely beside the point.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no questions.

Mr. WIRIN. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harper Poulson.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. POULSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HARPER (W.) POULSON, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, A. L. WIRIN

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. POULSON. My name is Harper Poulson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record?

Mr. WIRING. A. L. Wirin of Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where and when were you born, Mr. Poulson?

Mr. POULSON. I was born in Lincoln, Nebr., August 4, 1913.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. POULSON. In Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of the State of California?

Mr. POULSON. I came out here shortly after I got out of the Army in World War II. I guess it was April 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you serve in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. POULSON. Two years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. POULSON. The usual grammar school and high school. That was East Orange, N. J. Then I studied at Oberlin College in Ohio, and then completed a B.A. at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was that?

Mr. POULSON. To the best of my recollection, it must have been somewhere around 1935. I don't think you want me to stop now and count fingers on it, do you?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is accurate enough.

Mr. POULSON. After that I worked for a while, and then went to the University of London, where I studied for a little more than 2 years; no degree as a result.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a Rhodes scholar?

Mr. POULSON. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of time in which you pursued your educational training in London?

Mr. POULSON. That would be the autumn of 1936 through early 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has had a number of witnesses before it who did receive part of their educational training in London, where they became acquainted with the activities of the Communist Party in London. Did you have any experience with the Communist Party in England?

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Tavenner, I am going to answer that question right away. In fact, the answer is yes. But I would like to explain something, if I may, briefly.

I am an unwilling witness here. However, I intend to answer any and all questions pertaining to myself, my actions or beliefs at any time. I am not going to, however, answer questions relating to my associations with any other individuals. I am going to invoke, on advice of counsel, the protection of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution, and there may be at times some question of relevancy.

I would like to explain, still briefly, that I have never done anything, I am sure, that would give me any cause to have fear about testifying about anything I may have ever done or thought.

However, I have observed that acts which in themselves are in no way illegal sometimes, when wrapped up in conspiracy charges, become acts which have the effect of making a person liable legally, and I have no control over the acts of others with whom I may have associated, and I therefore feel that I need the protection of the fifth amendment of the Constitution with regard to such questions.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Following on the statement, I am sure that counsel has advised the witness of the possible jeopardy of the course of action he proposes to follow.

Is this the case, do you realize that by answering certain questions in a given line of questioning and declining to answer others having to do with the same subject matter, that conceivably you will have waived your rights under the interpretations of the law?

Mr. POULSON. Congressman Jackson, as you know, my attorney is Mr. Wirin, who has a lot of experience in these things. I am guiding myself by his counsel. However, it is also true that I think the committee would want to know whether I am fully aware of the possible consequences of my course of action. To the best of my belief, my course of actions do not place me in jeopardy, but I am aware of the fact that there may be differences of opinion here, that there are even ambiguities, perhaps, in the legal picture. What I am doing I am doing because I feel that I have to do it, having been summoned here.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no quarrel with whatever course of action you feel desirable to take. However, again, we must make the record clear, and for that reason I did want to know whether you were aware of possible jeopardy.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, I understand this, and I understand the necessity for you to say certain things for the record.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. WIRIN. May I confer for just a minute?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. POULSON. May I, on advice of counsel, add a word to what I just said? I repeat that I appreciate fully and I think I understand your position. I do think that it should be clear that counsel advises me, and I believe that I am not, in fact, waiving my rights, and I certainly don't want to waive any of my constitutional rights by the course of action I pursue.

Mr. JACKSON. That decision, of course, would not be made in this forum.

However, the record must be made clear to the extent that you have knowledge of a possibility of jeopardy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Poulson, we have learned through other hearings that we have conducted in this area within the recent past about the reorganization of the Communist Party in Southern California, the division of the Communist Party of the State of California into two districts, the Northern and the Southern District, and that the

Southern District is composed of approximately 28 sections. Are you a member of any one of those 28 sections?

Mr. POULSON. No, I am not, Mr. Tavenner, and the first time I had knowledge of all of the organizational information of which you just spoke was when I read about it in the newspapers, as alleged during the course of these hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you attended any district council meeting of the Southern California District of the Communist Party since April 1957?

Mr. POULSON. Perhaps we could simply facilitate matters here if I explain that I left the Communist Party in January, the first week of January of 1957. This would make it simpler to couch questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, have you attended a district council meeting of the Communist Party since April 1957?

Mr. POULSON. Well, it would follow that I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It would not necessarily follow.

Mr. POULSON. I beg your pardon. I didn't mean any disrespect, really.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand, but I just want to know whether you attended a meeting.

Mr. POULSON. No, sir.

Mr. WIRIN. He will tell you.

Mr. POULSON. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What time in January 1957 did you sever your membership with the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. It is almost beyond human power to be exact about it, but I would say it was—if I said January 1, 1957, that would be a very truthful answer. It may have been the 3d or the 2d.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that prior to the Sixteenth National Convention of the Communist Party or subsequent to it?

Mr. POULSON. I honestly am not sure about the date at which the convention was held, but it——

Mr. TAVENNER. February 9–12, 1957.

Mr. POULSON. But it seems to me that it was prior to it, because part of my complete decision to leave the party, as I recall, included—was a conviction on my part that that convention was not going to change anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you were disagreeing at that time with the objectives of the Communist Party, and you thought those objectives would not be changed?

Mr. POULSON. I was disagreeing at that time with some of the conduct of the party, some of its objectives, and I was of the opinion that, while there were many people who did disagree, they were not going to be able to make their views effectively felt within the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Because of the domination of the policies of the Communist Party from the top, is that what you mean?

Mr. POULSON. Yes. I believe that the Communist Party was organized in a way which made it very difficult for individuals within the organization who did differ to gain support for an effective expression of their views.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, what were the objectives of the Communist Party at that time with which you disagreed?

Mr. POULSON. Not in order to sidestep your question, but in order to facilitate matters, would it be all right if I answered in the form of stating what my beliefs were? I think it a little easier to organize.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. I am not interested in what your beliefs were. I am interested——

Mr. POULSON. I mean on that subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am interested only in what the objectives of the Communist Party were.

Mr. POULSON. All right. I will try to——

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very interesting to hear the witness' statement in the form he proposes to make it, going a step further, and pointing out specifically as you go along these things to which you took exception or to which you objected.

Mr. POULSON. This would inevitably come out, and I felt that it might be—give a more completely truthful picture.

Mr. MOULDER. You may proceed along that line.

Mr. POULSON. Thank you. I found myself, by the time at which I left the Communist Party, convinced that while there might be many good things to be said about a Socialist method of organizing the economy of a country, it was inconceivable that we in America would ever have a form of organization politically and in other respects which would resemble that of any other country, the Soviet Union, or any other country. I came to the conclusion that in America, the United States, we are so wedded to democracy, to both its contents and its forms, whatever weaknesses our democracy may have and however often we may slip in enforcing it, we are so wedded to it that any economic changes that would come in this country would have to come about through constitutional processes, and in ways which are native to our United States way of life.

Now, I had believed, that is, by and large, all of the time that I was in the Communist Party—and you may think me mistaken—that it had been my impression that all Communists in the United States believed this.

I am aware that historically there was a time when this was not so, but that predated my being in the Communist Party.

As you know, the constitution of the Communist Party of the United States carried a provision against advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence and said that anyone who did do so should be expelled from the party, and, believe me, when I read that, I believed it fully, as I felt many other Communists did.

But what happens in life, you see, is that you may believe in a principle, and yet when you are working out practical day-to-day tactics or attitudes toward other people, you find that you are being led into taking tactical positions which may be interpreted by others as not concerned with the principle you believe in, and you may find that some of your fellow workers in an organization are so—how will I put it—lopsided in their weighing of the evidence, as regards this country or other countries, that with the best will in the world they simply can't come out to what you consider to be an objective, correct evaluation of the situation.

I would like to distinguish here between two things for the sake of clarity. It was always uncomfortable—I think any Communist would tell you this if he were talking about it—to be a member of the Com-

munist Party, because it was hard work, and it was a pretty dedicated proposition. It wasn't a popular thing to do, and, you know, if you did it, usually, you were tied up.

But we are all used to putting up with certain curbs on our individual freedom, whatever organization or situation we find ourselves in, and so, even though one might not like the idea of being limited in the expressions of one's opinions, you will put up with it if you felt that the goals justified it, if you felt that over all the goals were fine, good, human goals.

I don't mean to paint a comparison, but you, for example, as an office holder, certainly submit every day to certain kinds of disciplines. You don't say everything you feel like saying as an individual or do everything you feel like doing. There are problems of good manners, problems of getting along with other people, problems of this kind of thing.

So that mere impatience or annoyance with this kind of difficulty, I don't think would have been enough to make me leave the Communist Party.

There had to be a change of belief as to how history was moving and as to what direction I as an individual wanted to see history moving.

There was a time when I did feel, although I didn't think socialism or communism, if it came in the United States, would resemble that in the Soviet Union, you know, to the letter; there was a time, nevertheless, when I did feel that we were caught in the world today in a struggle between reaction and progress, and to me at that time a move, as I saw it, forward to socialism and communism represented progress.

I felt that history couldn't stand still, and if we didn't move forward we would move back, and like a lot of people I felt, for example, back in the 1930's, that communism by its behavior in the League of Nations, by its general philosophy, represented the only effective alternative to fascism, and I hated fascism, and there is no—I made up my mind which way I wanted to go.

I don't believe that that is the choice with which we are confronted any more. I am not sure whether I believe that it ever was, but, at any rate, at the moment I am convinced that the big issues for all of us today are the problems of the preservation of peace and retention of the greatest freedom of the individual that we can possibly retain, because I feel that that is part and parcel of making life rich and full and meaningful to the human race.

If that is true, then to get bogged down in hot and heavy battling over, you know, the Socialist form of economy—this is the capital form of economy, and letting this develop into a kind of life and death struggle, which could lead to a third world war if it were not confined to debate, or within this country, which could lead to Americans losing trust in each other—and shoving each other instead of communicating with each other, then I think that is dangerous, and I think that is putting one's emphasis on issues which history has already moved away from.

It is my impression, frankly, that the Soviet Union and the United States both have tremendous problems. I think their problem, where individual liberty is concerned, is greater than our problem here. I think we have more of it here. But we both have it.

I think both countries are concerned with the kind of problem that seems to be bothering all outstanding thinkers today, how can the individual remain free in a world which is becoming highly populated, highly technicalized, industrialized, urbanized, so that it is so easy for the individual to feel that he counts for nothing, but only the elite governs his country, and nothing he does can make any difference.

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt? Is that an answer to the question?

Mr. WIRIN. It is a little. May I speak to the witness for a moment?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. WIRIN. And give some legal and other advice?

I reminded him what the question was.

Mr. POULSON. I hadn't forgotten, but I apologize if I have been——

Mr. JACKSON. I find the testimony extremely interesting.

Mr. POULSON. I hope the committee—I think the committee understands that these are such complex questions that if you begin to oversimplify, it is very easy——

Mr. WIRIN. However, he is a lawyer and I am a lawyer and Mr. Jackson is a lawyer. The question is——

Mr. JACKSON. I am no lawyer, I am sorry.

Mr. WIRIN. No?

Mr. JACKSON. We have been arguing all these years. A lot of law has rubbed off on me. But I am no lawyer.

Mr. WIRIN. You certainly sound like one, like the best of them, I mean.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Tavenner, if I may, to return to what, after all, was the——

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, let's try to be as directly responsive to the question as you can.

Mr. POULSON. To return to what I think was the essence of the question, you can see that, feeling as I did, I felt that the Communist Party had lost its relationship to reality in America, if it ever had it, and in the world, and was bound to become more and more an ineffective set of people who, no matter how sincere, simply didn't understand the times in which they were living, and that this was going to lead continually to seek to mount campaigns and to take positions which were, in some cases, academic and in others, in my opinion, provocative. They weren't going to win adherence to their position. If anything, they were going to alienate people from even those parts of their program with which generally most Americans wouldn't disagree and——

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it actually hampered good causes?

Mr. POULSON. This was part of my conclusion, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I gather from your statement that you also disagreed violently with the Communist Party's exercising of control over the individual, that the individual didn't have the freedom of action within the Communist Party that you thought he should have?

Mr. WIRIN. "Violent" as a figure of speech, I take it? I don't understand the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the witness understands.

Mr. WIRIN. All right.

Mr. POULSON. Let me try to answer it as I understand it, and if I have misunderstood then you will correct me.

I have already indicated that I feel that human beings put up with curbs on their individual freedom in everything they do; in the shop I don't talk back to the foreman whenever I feel like it. I want to keep my job.

However, I am not trying to split hairs. It is quite obvious that in an organization like the Communist Party the degree of conformity which tends to be produced goes far beyond that, as most organizations, and might be likened only to the most dedicated religious groups or other moral crusades.

Mr. TAVENNER. They called it democratic centralism, didn't they?

Mr. POULSON. There is a procedure theoretically, and actually it is adhered to in the letter, whereby any member of the party makes with a difference in the group of which he is a member, and if he isn't satisfied with the outcome of the decision there, he can go an echelon higher, and all the way up to the central committee, or whatever it is now, and the national convention of the party.

But, in practice, even when you adhere to this, the letter, it does place the dissenter in the position of being an individual bucking committees or groups which, by and large, do adhere around an established line or position, and there is a ban on what is called forming a faction, which means a group in opposition to an established policy.

And my experience has indicated to me that unless you are going to form groups in opposition to established policies, you have no way of changing policy. You have effectively stifled opposition.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were aware even before the holding of the Sixteenth National Convention of the Communist Party in New York in February 1957 of the situation of Joseph Clark, the editor-in-chief of the Daily Worker, and also John Gates, weren't you?

Mr. POULSON. Seems to me Gates was the editor-in-chief and Clark was a foreign correspondent and columnist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Correct.

Mr. POULSON. May I confer with my attorney?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether you were familiar with this situation in which they found themselves in the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. I was reading at that time not only the People's World but also, when I got ahold of copies of it, the Daily Worker, and the Sunday Worker, and I was reading their statements and editorials, and I was aware of the situation in which they found themselves, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you objected to a Communist Party line, you immediately became a revisionist?

Mr. POULSON. Yes, that's true. It is hard for me to get too indignant, because I was guilty so often on the same thing. I called other people revisionists and got self-righteous and called them names, but it is a fact——

Mr. TAVENNER. The point of it is, you reacted unfavorably, although it took some time to translate that into real action on your part, to the lack of freedom that the individual had within the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. Yes, that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was one of the practices of the Communist Party which caused you finally to break with it?

Mr. POULSON. That was extremely uncomfortable, and I disliked it very much. But I have to say in honesty that I don't know whether that alone would have been enough to get me out of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I didn't mean to indicate that alone——

Mr. MOULDER. The point you raised—maybe I got an erroneous impression—but you favored, if any changes were to be made in our form of Government, that they be achieved through our constitutional processes; did I understand you to believe or to understand that in the Communist Party they did not or do not wish to follow that procedure?

Mr. POULSON. Sir, it was always my belief, and I am being fairly honest, that the Communist Party of the United States, while I was a member of it, believed in following constitutional processes, and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, this was the opinion of the party, and certainly was my opinion.

Mr. MOULDER. I got the impression that was your opinion, but not that of the party.

Mr. POULSON. No, but I had this feeling, that some of the members of the party had evidently lost faith in these constitutional processes to the extent that, while even in their own mind they might say that they still believed in them, they lacked the conviction which would enable them in the American arena to try to accomplish the changes in that way.

Of course, I thought the result was, they just weren't going to get anywhere. It wasn't that I was afraid or thought that these people were going to try to organize the forcible overthrow of the Government; I just felt that they were accomplishing nothing and couldn't accomplish anything because of their lack of real working faith in the processes by which we thrash out political questions in America.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, that arrives to about the same conclusion that I made; that was your opinion that you had of the members of the Communist Party.

Mr. POULSON. I am not trying to hedge, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I understand.

Mr. POULSON. But the part is that I do not happen to agree with the committee that the Communist Party is an illegal conspiracy, and therefore I can't permit myself to be put in a position of seeming to agree with that.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. JACKSON. Let's add a little something to the record. That is not a determination made solely by this committee. This is a determination that has been made by all three branches of the Federal Government, and the chairman reminds me, on several occasions by the Supreme Court of the United States. So it is not—I want the record to show—we didn't think up this idea that this was a conspiracy.

Mr. POULSON. I didn't mean to indicate——

Mr. JACKSON. I realize.

Mr. POULSON. I happen to feel that the court decisions are still somewhat contradictory. In the Schneiderman case the Supreme Court held it was possible to be a Communist and that this was com-

pletely compatible with believing in constitutional changes in the United States and wasn't illegal in itself per se.

It is a muddy picture. I wish it weren't so muddy.

Mr. JACKSON. We operate as a committee in this area at the behest of the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. POULSON. I understand that.

Mr. JACKSON. Which is a fact that is frequently overlooked for one reason or another. We are not self-appointed judges to determine whether or not it is a conspiracy. Our job is to attempt to find out to the extent we can whether or not it is. That is our sole function.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you wish the question were not so muddy?

Mr. POULSON. I am not talking about your question, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I understand, the question of the validity of the Communist Party. This committee has never gone to the extent of recommending so far that the Communist Party be outlawed, but what would be your position on that? Do you think it should be, in light of what you know of it?

Mr. POULSON. In the light of what I know of the Communist Party, as far as the last two years are concerned, very little, but I don't know of any reason to suppose that it has changed very essentially. In the light of what I know, I feel that while there are certain consequences that no constitution is going to protect you from, if you espouse an unpopular idea—this follows—that by and large the Communist Party is composed of sincere men and women who are trying to be patriotic, although their opinion as to what is patriotic may be at loggerheads with even that of most other Americans, and I feel that they should not be outlawed.

Moreover, I feel that the attempt to outlaw the party in fact, if not in law, de facto if not de jure, by making it very uncomfortable, economically and in terms of social pressure, to be a member; I feel that the attempt to do that is impractical.

I, for example, suffered a lot of consequences from being a Communist when I remained one, but these sanctions didn't drive me out of the Communist Party. I am normal and I am human and I am nervous about adverse economic consequences that might affect my family and so on, but, nevertheless, they didn't drive me out and I don't think they would drive anybody else out, and they may even have the effect, you know—here is where American tradition comes into play again. Somebody says to you, "You can't say that," and one's reaction is, by golly, I am going to say it.

It is not an altogether bad thing. Sometimes it can be, lead to adolescent behavior, childish behavior. You let yourself get provoked. But it is a kind of stubborn belief that everybody has a right to his opinion and to speak his piece.

Mr. MOULDER. What is the next question?

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that your disagreement with the Communist Party, exercise of control was one of the reasons that caused you to leave the Communist Party. What other policy of the Communist Party was it with which you objected and which played a part in your leaving the party? So far you have only stated one.

Mr. POULSON. I felt there were several fields—I think it is a little too close now—I felt there were several fields into which I can break down my objections, and of course they related—these things always did—I felt that the Communist Party had become too arrogant, too self-righteous in its relation to other groups of Americans; that it didn't have proper regard for or respect for or understanding of the opinions of Republicans, Democrats, the Negro people and their organizations, the Jewish people and their organizations, the trade unions. I felt that it was insisting on its own dogmatic interpretation and was therefore presuming, like a government in exile, for example, as one writer put it, to hand down—condescending to these other groups of Americans what kind of a position they should take, and I thought this was not only self-defeating, but flatly wrong.

This was in the field of its relations with domestic groups.

Then, with regard to the fight for peace in the world—and I don't think there is much question but what the Communists that I knew wanted peace—there was always a disposition to explain away any show of power politics by the Soviet Union as somehow or other a great blow for peace.

Now, our country sometimes plays power politics; all governments do; and I get a little ashamed when we are hypercritical about the things we do, that I thought that a movement which prided itself on being honest and, you know, very morally highminded, ought not to confuse itself by confusing what seemed to me to be power politics with unselfish work for peace, and I am referring to a whole number of things.

I felt that any statement by government leaders of the Soviet Union or the United States—I am talking now about the Communist Party beliefs—which were bellicose or provocative were dangerous in today's world, and I felt that if they wanted to help the cause of peace they ought to confine themselves to peaceful moves and peaceful statements, and even might sometimes have a slap in the face now and then and not be provoked by it. I thought that that would be very much truer of a government which wanted, above all things, to preserve world peace, and I felt that the refusal or inability of other Communists, some of them, at any rate, to understand the actions of the Soviet Government in what I felt was an objective and critical way had an adverse effect on the reputation of Communists in the eyes of other people, and had an adverse effect on their own clarity of thought.

I felt that they were kidding themselves.

Then take a particular thing like the Negro question or, you know, the struggle of the Negro people in the United States for full and equal citizenship without discrimination. I happen to be one of those who think that the Negro people have been doing a magnificent job on this score for themselves. I think they have shown great restraint; they have shown tremendous knowledge of how not to be provoked, and nevertheless make their own point and make it with increasing effectiveness, and yet I felt that the Communist Party was still trying to advise in a manner I felt was presumptuous, and now I think it was presumptuous all the time I was in the Communist Party, in some respects and some degrees.

Mr. MOULDER. You think they were trying to advise; you mean also agitate, to encourage racial strife? The Communist Party has done that.

Mr. POULSON. The Communist Party believes a certain course of action is a correct one, unless some of its members are too tired or too nervous or inept; it tries to forward this course of action by agitation, by publication, by statement, and actually by participating in campaigns, and so on.

Mr. MOULDER. You made a very voluminous statement, you could write a book about when you referred to it as a government in exile. I think that is very descriptive.

Mr. POULSON. I think it is a descriptive statement for the ponderosity of Communist Party statements on occasion. I can't claim credit for the phrase.

Mr. JACKSON. I imagine we could probably, Mr. Poulson, find a great many more areas of disagreement than we could find in agreement, but I was particularly impressed by your reference to the Negroes having met their own problems in this country. The problems are many, and many of them we don't like, and we see no reason for their existence.

There was a colloquy here yesterday between one of the witnesses and myself, and I thought afterwards that here in the city of Los Angeles there was given one of the finest demonstrations in the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum when 93,000 members of every race, every creed, every color, turned out to do honor to a Negro baseball catcher. That was a great demonstration.

What we like to think of as the American spirit was demonstrated there better than in any single thing that has happened in this community for a long time.

The records of this committee are replete with testimony from Negroes who have been in the Communist Party and who have come out of it frustrated and embittered by what they found, as opposed to what they had hoped to find when they went in. I think that because of the many difficulties which the Negroes have experienced in this country, that the record they have achieved in handling many of their own problems is a remarkable one, and I was very happy to hear you say so.

Mr. POULSON. I assume you would agree also with me that we will be very happy when the day comes when no Negro member or any other such minority group is ever subjected to indignity or discrimination because of his color or his race.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure that all of the members of the committee would be in full accord with you on that point.

Mr. MOULDER. Our records show that even though the Communist Party has concentrated its attention on the Negro people or groups in this country, has tried to prey upon the prejudice and so-called discrimination, it has had less success with the Negroes in that respect than any other.

Mr. POULSON. I don't want to——

Mr. MOULDER. Let us not prolong the discussion.

The next question, please.

Mr. POULSON. I would like to say, if I may, that I don't subscribe to the view that Communists have been trying to use Negroes. In my opinion, there has been a sincere desire to help. I feel it has often been misguided and misdirected and has led to the pursuing of tactics which could easily enough be interpreted as——

Mr. MOULDER. We have evidence where they have deliberately agitated trouble and created trouble in the guise of racial discrimination, which they themselves have created, in order to agitate and stir up trouble with the Negro people.

Proceed with the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other objective of the Communist Party which played a part in your resignation from it?

Mr. POULSON. Well, specifically, as you know, following the Twentieth Congress in the Soviet Union, where that famous secret nonsecret report was made, there was an awful lot of discussion in the left wing in this country, and even in liberal and conservative circles, an attempt to evaluate, what does this mean. A lot of people, some of whom I suppose have subsequently left the Communist Party—others of whom may not have—began to develop the idea of trying to create a different kind of radical movement in the United States, which could give some kind of leadership, as they felt in the ideological fight to win the American people's thinking.

An awful lot of discussion took place on the question. Well, should there be a new kind of Communist Party or should there be a new kind of Socialist Party, or should there be a new kind of Progressive Party, or what in the world should there be.

But I came to the conclusion that all of these proposals were ineffective and stillborn, and missed the main point, which was if you want to look for radicalism in American life you look for it in the same places that you find diehardism; you find radicalism in the Republican, in the Democratic Parties; you find it in the Protestant Churches; you find it everywhere.

In other words, if you want to find people who have advanced understanding and the need to fight for peace in the world today, you can't look to any one sector of Americans to find this; you find it everywhere, and if you want to find people who are terribly and deeply concerned with human freedom, you find it not only among radicals, but you find it among people whom radicals sometimes call reactionaries, very often a wellspring of the motivation of people that radicals call reactionaries, is their deep concern with human freedom.

Mr. MOULDER. Let's proceed with the question, get off this discourse of philosophy.

Mr. POULSON. I am sorry. What I meant was that I just couldn't agree that there was any effective role in America today for an organization which could be called a vanguard organization or radical organization. I don't object to other people being in it. They have a right. But not for me.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been a very strong indication, in fact, it can be documented, that an effort was to be made to organize the people who withdrew from the Communist Party into another organization of some type, which would still continue to cooperate with the Communist Party in its objectives. That note was sounded in a

list of grievances signed by 22 people, members of the Communist Party here in Los Angeles. Do you know anything about that movement?

Mr. POULSON. I only know that what you say may be true, simply on the basis of the fact that I know that there were people who were discontent with the way the Communist Party was being run, but in general felt that there might be some other way of forwarding its objectives. I don't know at firsthand. Nobody has ever asked me to join such a group, maybe because I have made my disinterest very clear from the start. I don't know.

I have no direct first-hand knowledge or even second-hand hearsay knowledge of the existence of any such group or any attempt to form it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been aware, since severing your connection with the Communist Party, or prior to your leaving, of an effort to avoid the provisions of law relating to membership in a Communist Party group by withdrawing as organizational members but still being affiliated with the Communist Party in a way to carry out their Communist Party duties in every way except that of being members?

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Tavenner, you know that two horse race players can read the same form sheet and then decide to put their money on different horses. You can make two interpretations of the same thoughts. I know of instances where people who probably did not change their personal inner convictions—I want to be consistent—Let's say I know of an instance where I, not having changed my inner personal convictions, nevertheless ceased to be a member of the Communist Party. I became a member later. This was when I went into the Armed Forces of the United States.

Now, as far as I was concerned, this was a perfectly sincere and practical move. When you are fighting a war, you know, for your country, and you are a soldier in an army, you have one allegiance, that is, to the Army. You may have, you know, moral feelings about how to personally behave and so on, but you certainly—you can't take orders from two places. It is out of the question and——

Mr. TAVENNER. You thought the two things would be inconsistent?

Mr. POULSON. I felt that at that time it might be open to misinterpretation, at any rate. It might be thought by some people to be disloyal if I were a Communist, and I simply didn't want to get into that situation. I wanted to see that war won and I wanted to take a full part in it and I left the Communist Party.

I think this is the kind of situation such as you are describing, and I think many people might feel that I did it for subterfuge, dishonest motives, and I couldn't prevent their feeling that way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, but I had reference to those persons who withdrew as actual members of the Communist Party but who continued in their Communist Party work and support of the Communist Party.

Mr. POULSON. At this point, Mr. Tavenner, I want to be careful to be consistent in the position that I am taking here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, it isn't a question of being consistent; it is a question of giving us facts.

Mr. POULSON. I don't want to talk about my associations with other individuals, and if I were to say that I have specific knowledge of some such person other than myself in such an act, this would be talking

about my associations with other individuals, and I frankly am not at all clear as to what extent I can generalize, without spoiling my consistency in this matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that is a very vital question in this hearing. We are attempting here, among other things, to determine whether or not the definition of membership, as contained in the laws relating to subversion, should be tightened, whether or not the conditions set forth in Article 5 of the Communist Control Act of 1954 as to what the courts should consider on this question should be enlarged.

Mr. POULSON. I understand the purpose.

Mr. TAVENNER. So the question I am asking you is very vital to that issue, and we want to know how it is that persons who are members of the Communist Party can withdraw membership and still cooperate, aid and support the organization in every way except that of being technical members. That is the question that I am asking.

Mr. POULSON. I recognize that the thing you are describing is perfectly possible of being done.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any knowledge or information about it, of it actually existing?

Mr. POULSON. But even if I were talking about other persons, I don't know, in all sincerity, how one could decide, how one could crawl inside somebody's mind and know whether they were sincere or——

Mr. TAVENNER. You continually come back to that. I am not talking about thoughts or beliefs. I said action and support, active support. I am not talking about beliefs at all.

Mr. POULSON. Well, I am not trying to sidestep you at all, either.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just come right to the direct question of continuing to support the Communist Party in its activities.

Mr. POULSON. I would like to consult with my counsel for just a moment, if I may.

I wanted to get my counsel's advice at this moment, because I made it clear at the outset that I am willing to talk about myself, and I am doing it and have done it, and I feel that this question involves the conduct of others, and that I had better decline to answer the question on the grounds that I laid out at the outset.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no recourse except to suggest you direct him to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness will be directed to answer. I am not clear as to what grounds you claimed as a reason for declining to answer.

Mr. POULSON. At the outset——

Mr. MOULDER. Did you claim the provisions, invoking the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution?

Mr. POULSON. I think that I—with regard to answering questions about associations with other persons, I claim the protection of the first and the fifth amendments to the Constitution. From time to time questions of pertinency might arise, but I haven't made—that is a complicated thing.

Mr. JACKSON. You decline to answer this question on the grounds previously stated?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. POULSON. I must respectfully maintain, I decline to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Short recess taken.)

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tavenner, the members of the press tell me that they understood me to say that I was in the Armed Forces for 2 days.

Mr. MOULDER. That you what?

Mr. POULSON. That I was in the Armed Forces for 2 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said 2 years.

Mr. POULSON. I thought I said 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said 2 years.

Mr. POULSON. But I thought anybody can make a slip of this kind, and I thought I better——

Mr. JACKSON. Anybody who can stay in the Armed Forces for only 2 days is a genius.

Mr. WIRIN. But I had told him the press is never wrong.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed with the next question.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. POULSON. I am an unsuccessful writer and a fairly successful machinist, to earn money while I am trying to be a writer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been the period of your membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. I initially joined the Communist Party back in the midthirties. It seems to me that it was approximately 1935. It is difficult to be sure.

I remained in the Communist Party or in the Communist League or considered myself a full-fledged member of the Communist movement from then until the time I told you I left the party—that was January 1957, with the exception of the time that I was in the Armed Forces, the Army.

Mr. JACKSON. In connection with that, during the time that you were in the armed services, the period of 2 years, did you continue in any way in your Communist Party activity?

Mr. POULSON. The answer to that question would be "No," unless you could construe trying to be a good soldier in a war that was supported by the Communist Party an implementation of Communist Party——

Mr. JACKSON. No. I had reference to any contact with any Communist meeting, Communist groups, during the period of your service.

Mr. POULSON. Here I want to be very explicit, because I don't want to be in a position of perhaps telling an untruth.

Mr. JACKSON. I have no information. I don't mean to entrap you.

Mr. POULSON. I was informed at one time by an officer in the division to which I was attached overseas that it was their understanding that while I was on furlough after my basic training, prior to being shipped overseas, that I attended a young Communist meeting. At that time I honestly could not recall having done so. If I did, I am sure it was because people I was acquainted with, friends of mine, were there, and I was home on furlough, and it was a chance to see them.

It didn't have any organizational significance, with the possible exception of that. The answer to your question is an unqualified "No." I had no contacts or organizational relationship at any time during that period with other Communists or Communist groups or anything of the kind.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the general understanding among members of the Communist Party who went into the service, one of the armed services, that he should during that period of time be considered as a non-member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. It was my understanding at the time that this was the normal and correct thing for any Communist to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party consider it as a military furlough; had you heard it spoken of in that way?

Mr. POULSON. I think the Communist Party—I never heard the phrase, although it may have been used; I think the Communist Party felt that everything should be subordinated to seeing that the war was won, and that it would be foolish and unrealistic for Communists who went into the Army to try to function in any way which might distract from their purpose of being there, which was to, you know, carry on the fight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what unit of the Communist Party were you a member at the time you withdrew in 1957?

Mr. POULSON. At the time that I——

Mr. TAVENNER. Withdrew from the Communist Party.

Mr. POULSON. I was not a member of any club at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member at large?

Mr. POULSON. I suppose you would call me a member at large.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long had you been a member at large?

Mr. POULSON. I think it must have been about 2 years, the length of time that I was a reporter for the Daily People's World, and keeping all kinds of hours on that job. It wasn't practical to belong to a party club.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee what is meant by membership at large.

Mr. POULSON. In this instance, all that was—what was meant was that I was considered to be fulfilling any organizational responsibilities that I might have by the kind of job I was doing.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you began your membership in the Communist Party in 1935. Where was that?

Mr. POULSON. Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member in Cleveland?

Mr. POULSON. Well, it couldn't have been too long. I joined when I was working on the Cleveland Press, and at the time, if you will recall, it was the time of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and the Milwaukee Journal strikes, which the Newspaper Guild was forming, and then already in September 1936 I went abroad to study.

Before that I spent, if I recall, I spent the summer on vacation. So that——

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the group or the name of the Communist Party cell to which you were assigned in Cleveland?

Mr. POULSON. Believe me, I haven't the faintest idea. This is honest. It is like another life, so far ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you say you were a member at large for a period of 2 years. What club or group of the Communist Party was it that you were a member of prior to your becoming a member at large?

Mr. POULSON. I was a member of a club or a group which centered generally in the Bay area, and I don't honestly remember whether it had a name. I am not trying——

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period of 2 years when you were a member at large, who was the superior to whom you had to report as a member at large?

Mr. POULSON. Of course, Mr. Tavenner, on this question I must decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I have to ask for direction.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee directs the witness to answer the question.

Mr. POULSON. Again, I respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask, Mr. Counsel, what was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was, the name of his superior during the period of time that he was a member at large.

Mr. JACKSON. The name of his superior in the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. In the Communist Party.

Mr. POULSON. Perhaps it will clarify the record, I decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution and possible pertinency of the question.

Mr. MOULDER. His immediate superior?

Mr. TAVENNER. His immediate superior. My question said, the person to whom he reported or was responsible to.

Mr. WIRIN. Would you permit me just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to say this: That if a witness appears here and is willing to talk about himself and give you extended information concerning himself, and then there are very refined and technical distinctions drawn as to when he waives his privilege, that is why so many persons are required to take the absolute fifth and give no information at all.

It seems to me the committee is confronted with a very serious choice as to whether it is going to be technical and insist upon a person naming others, when many persons of conscience refuse to do that, or invite information and give a person reasonable freedom from going to jail in doing so.

Mr. JACKSON. May I make a comment: I think there is considerable validity in what counsel has to say. However, I think that it is perfectly clear that the menace, if any, in a conspiracy is not the simple idea, but the people who implement the idea. The committee cannot leave the judgment to a witness, whether or not any given individual is or is not a conspirator, or whether he is or is not presently a member of the Communist Party. It is the people who take the idea and move forward with it who constitute the danger, rather than the simple idea itself, which, without people, would be useless and void.

For that reason the committee has taken the position that while such information as is being presently given by the witness is valuable, growing as it does out of his own experience——

Mr. MOULDER. And that the committee doesn't accept the proposition that the witness has the discretion of deciding whether or not——

Mr. WIRIN. I am not making that contention.

Mr. JACKSON. Exactly, moral compunctions may be and are a very fine thing.

Mr. WIRIN. They are, no question about it.

Mr. JACKSON. They are indeed, but they do not constitute, and as I think you will agree, a legal ground for declining to answer a question.

Mr. WIRIN. They did in the Watkins case.

Mr. JACKSON. For my part, Mr. Chairman, because we have reached the crux of this matter in the declination of the witness to answer, I would respectfully request that the witness again be directed to answer the question as to what individual in the Communist Party he reported his activities; his, shall we say, immediate superior or reporting superior.

Mr. MOULDER. In accordance with the request of Mr. Jackson, the witness is directed by the committee to answer the question.

Mr. POULSON. I must again, Mr. Chairman, respectfully decline to answer the question, not only because I don't wish for moral reasons to be in the position of talking about others but because I feel that I require the protection of the first and the fifth amendments to the Constitution, and there may be some doubt in my mind as to the question of pertinency, as well.

May I speak with him?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. POULSON. My counsel, after conferring with him, advises me that I ought to point out flatly that I feel that the question is not pertinent to the bona fide purposes of this investigation, in addition to the other statements made.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you read the opening statement that the chairman made at the beginning of this hearing, which includes the resolution?

Mr. POULSON. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the committee. I think then it is not necessary for me to make any further explanation of the question of pertinency.

Have you held any position of leadership in the Communist Party in Los Angeles during the past 5 years?

Mr. POULSON. Answering the question in two parts, on technical positions of leadership, you know, where one nominally holds an office, I believe there was a time within that 5-year period you speak of, during the first of those 5 years, when I was a chairman of a Communist Party club.

Mr. TAVENNER. What club was that?

Mr. POULSON. It was the club to which I told you I belonged before I became a member at large.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to which you do not recall its name?

Mr. POULSON. I honestly do not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it in a particular area, composed of members from a particular area?

Mr. POULSON. It was composed of people who in general lived in the Bay area.

Mr. TAVENNER. What part of the Bay area, was it Santa Monica, for instance?

Mr. POULSON. When I say the Bay area, I include in my mind Santa Monica, Venice, West Los Angeles, Mar Vista, Brentwood, even—you know how these lines of gerrymander—perhaps even parts of Culver City of Beverly Hills, I am not sure; that general area which some people refer to as the North Bay area.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you would identify the places where the meetings were held, that may be of some assistance to us in understanding what group of the Communist Party it was that you were connected with.

Mr. POULSON. I think meetings were generally held in Venice or Santa Monica. I think there may also have been——

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you chairman of that group?

Mr. POULSON. I would have to do some real scratching to give you an accurate answer, but I would estimate, offhand, that I was chairman of that group for perhaps a half a year, maybe even a year, some kind of period in that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any other position of leadership in the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. I have never held, to the best of my knowledge, any other nominal position of any kind in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the last two years of your membership as a member at large, did I understand you to say you had some connection with the Daily People's World?

Mr. POULSON. I was a reporter.

Mr. TAVENNER. A reporter.

Mr. POULSON. For the Los Angeles Bureau of the Daily People's World, 1955, 1956.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you write a column for the paper?

Mr. POULSON. There was a period of time during which, among other things, I wrote a column.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your going with that paper result from any conference that you had with Communist Party leaders in this area?

Mr. POULSON. Yes, it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then the Communist Party organization desired you to take this position with the paper?

Mr. POULSON. That was my understanding.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you find other persons engaged in staff work with that paper who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. That question, sir, I must decline to answer on the grounds I have already indicated, where questions of association with others are concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. POULSON. I must again respectfully decline to answer the question on the grounds indicated, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Daily People's World the official organ of the Communist Party in this area?

Mr. POULSON. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it was not. Many people, however, thought that it was, both those people in the Communist Party and people outside the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have received a great deal of evidence indicating that it was understood in the Communist Party that each member

engage in some particular work in a mass organization. That was expected of him as a member of the Communist Party.

Did that principle have anything to do with your taking this position with the Daily People's World?

Mr. POULSON. You mean did the Communist Party regard the Daily People's World as a kind of mass organization participation which would fulfill the desire for a mass activity for a Communist?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not quite. I refer to the fact that that was the practice of the Communist Party, as we understand, to have its members to go out into mass organizations and perform services for the Communist Party there.

Now, my question was whether or not, in going into the work of the Daily People's World, you considered you were performing that duty as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. POULSON. Primarily, it never occurred to me to think of that as a mass activity.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is a little different.

Mr. POULSON. I felt that in becoming a reporter for the Daily People's World I was fulfilling a function, including Communists or non-Communists who might read it, in trying to report what was going on and give the readers an accurate picture of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you resigned from the Communist Party, did you resign from the Daily People's World?

Mr. POULSON. No, I had already left the Daily People's World shortly before resigning from the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would you say that the two acts were virtually joint?

Mr. POULSON. At the time that I left the staff of the Daily People's World, the paper was in financial difficulties. It was necessary to curtail stock. There was a question inevitably arising as to who should go.

I indicated that I would be willing to go, and this was accepted as the basis for a decision.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you did not consider the Daily People's World as a mass organization, in which I think your position is correct. But there were mass organizations in which you participated as a result of what you considered to be your duty as a member of the Communist Party, were there not?

Mr. POULSON. Maybe I am in a little different position from some people, in that although during my time as a Communist I frequently was not in a position to shout from the housetops that I was a Communist, nevertheless, I usually seemed to be engaged in some kind of activity which led almost everybody to assume that I was, and this put very severe limitations on my ability to join any kind of organization. It is true——

Mr. TAVENNER. You had already been disclosed, so to speak?

Mr. POULSON. Or I was self-exposed. You know, maybe I had a personal bent in that direction, anyway, because it is rough to believe in something and be able to say what you believe in, and hear people talk about it and not be able to talk back, and I was pretty constantly letting my views be heard and known.

I am not—I have been a member at a couple of occasions of what I would call general mass organizations, but it just happened that I

got into them through some other facet of my life, some problem, and not as a result of being sent there or urged there by the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. But if you had not already gotten into those mass organizations because of the special interest that you referred to, you probably would have been sent there anyway, wouldn't you?

Mr. POULSON. That is speculation, Mr. Tavenner. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was the practice in the Communist Party, wasn't it, to send members to the place where they were best fitted?

Mr. POULSON. When I was a Communist, I used to constantly urge my fellow Communists to go out and join what we called mass organizations, so that they, in the first place, could know what the people in the organizations were like and, secondly, could, I hoped, win the respect of their neighbors and friends in the work of these organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. And eventually get them into the Communist Party?

Mr. POULSON. Yes; I hoped very much that out of the contacts that were established in that way some of my fellow members would find others who agreed with them and would ultimately join the Communist Party, there is no question about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was the common practice and rule within the Communist Party, not just with you individually, but with the party as a whole?

Mr. POULSON. It was my understanding that it was the common practice and rule.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. I have just one question. I have found the testimony extremely interesting and I think in some respects helpful.

The question I would put to the witness, if he cares to answer it, there are a number of bewildered and somewhat befuddled, I think—young liberals in the country today. I know through my contacts with many of them, in talking at universities and so forth, that they are bewildered. I should like to have some comment from you, growing out of your own personal experience in the Communist Party over a period of years as to whether or not the Communist Party is the instrument which is going to serve to bring order into their disordered minds or whether or not they might better take their chance with American institutions, as imperfect as they may appear to be in the present state of world affairs.

Mr. POULSON. Well, Mr. Jackson, although I am a willing witness, I am unwilling to remain silent to any question which I feel I can answer, once I have been brought here.

Of course, I think it is pretty clear—I hope it is clear from the kind of testimony I have given—that I would above all urge these people not to make up their mind on the basis of fear of consequences, but on the basis of conviction, do the things they felt it was right to do, even though it might cost them something. Everything costs something.

It happens to be my personal opinion—and I am only one person; I am not speaking from high tribunal—it is just my personal opinion that, as I have stated before, that those people who want to see this

country become ever freer and stronger and greater and continue to live in a world of peace—and I think of my son and my daughter—will not find the most effective way of accomplishing this by associating themselves with relatively ineffective and unrealistic groups, such as I consider the Communist Party of the United States today to be.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you very much. The witness is excused.

How many more witnesses do we have this afternoon?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe five.

Mr. WIRIN. I have a couple that will be brief.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will recess until 1:30 p.m.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, Thursday, October 22, 1959, the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1959

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call the first witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. James McGowan, will you come forward, please, sir?

Mr. MOULDER. You are Mr. James McGowan?

Mr. MCGOWAN. That's right.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MCGOWAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES GEORGE McGOWAN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, BEN MARGOLIS

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. MCGOWAN. James George McGowan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record?

Mr. MARGOLIS. Ben Margolis.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. MCGOWAN. In New York City, July 6, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Elsinore, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the State of California?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Roughly, since 1930 or 1931.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, briefly your educational background?

Mr. MCGOWAN. I graduated from high school in New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Self-employed television repairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. McGowan, we have learned through the hearings we have conducted in Los Angeles that there was a rejuvenation of the Communist Party after the decision in the Yates case, as a result of which the Communist Party for the State of California was divided into a Northern and Southern District.

The Southern District has, we understand, 28 different units comprising that district. Are you at this time a member of any one of those units?

Mr. McGowan. I will not answer the question. I consider that it is an invasion of my rights. The committee which is—you claim to set up to investigate pertinent material—has no reason to inquire into my associations or my beliefs. I will not answer the question.

Mr. Tavenner. May I have a direction?

Mr. Moulder. The witness is directed to answer the question. Your response is not satisfactory.

Mr. McGowan. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the rights protecting my rights of the first amendment of the United States and the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution.

Mr. Tavenner. Have you attended any of the district meetings of the Communist Party for the Southern District of California since April 1957?

Mr. McGowan. This question and the question before, and I assume questions following I consider an invasion of my right of association, and I will not answer such questions. I will not answer on the grounds that I gave to the previous question.

Mr. Tavenner. Are you familiar with the report of Dorothy Healey relating to the program for work among youth in this area?

Mr. McGowan. This question is the same as the two before it. I will not answer questions that tend to probe into my thinking, my association and my activities. This is an invasion of my right guaranteed by the first amendment, and I will not answer on the ground of the first amendment and the fifth amendment, because these matters are not within the purview of this committee.

Mr. Tavenner. I am not asking you any question regarding your beliefs or your opinions, but I am as to your activities.

Now, haven't you been active in the youth work of the Communist Party for a number of years?

Mr. McGowan. This question, like the others, you are inquiring in an area which you are not entitled to inquire, and I'll not answer on the grounds already given.

Mr. Tavenner. I hand you a thermofax copy of a page taken from New Frontiers, and down in the right-hand corner there is a reference to you as an associate editor of New Frontiers.

Will you examine it, please, and state whether you were an associate editor of that magazine?

Mr. McGowan. This question, like the ones before, attempts to pry into my beliefs, my associations, and to this question I will also add the right of freedom of press.

Mr. Tavenner. I will read from the article:

New Frontiers is the official yearbook of the Young Communist League of California, issued on the occasion of the First Annual State Convention of the Young Communist League, held at Los Angeles on November 5, 6, and 7, 1937; editor, G. P. Hitchcock; business manager, Charles Sanford; associates, Ed Alexander, Jim McGowan.

I desire to offer the document in evidence, ask that it be marked "McGowan Exhibit 1."

Mr. Moulder. The document referred to by counsel will be admitted into evidence.

(Document marked "McGowan Exhibit No. 1" and retained in committee files.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the executive secretary for the Communist Party of Fresno, Tulare, and Kings Counties in California in 1942?

Mr. MCGOWAN. You are asking questions about association. You ask questions about association. They involve the matter of free speech, and since I do not consider that you have the right to inquire into my ideas and my associations, I'll not answer that question on the grounds given.

Mr. TAVENNER. The same grounds, first and fifth amendments?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1943 were you a member of the Harbor Section of the Communist Party of California?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Same kind of question. Do you want me to repeat the answer?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, if you say the same.

Mr. MCGOWAN. Same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947 were you the literature director of the Venice Club, 16th Congressional District, Los Angeles, Communist Party?

Mr. MCGOWAN. The same question, the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position do you hold in the Communist Party now?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Same question, kind of question, the same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you said your present residence was Elsinore?

Mr. MCGOWAN. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you at this time a member of the Communist Party group at Elsinore?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Now, continuing to ask questions of this kind strengthens in me the conviction that the purposes of the investigation are quite different from the purposes that you profess.

I believe that you would intend to use this committee to try to intimidate me, to try to intimidate other people, to try to proscribe ideas, and I'll not lend myself to this.

You may think that reading this resolution as to the purposes and the pertinence of your investigation is the final answer. I don't think it is.

I think more and more greater numbers of people are becoming dissatisfied with this kind of activity, resisting and investigating.

Mr. TAVENNER. What kind of investigations?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Into those and——

Mr. TAVENNER. You weren't referring to Communist Party activities?

Mr. MCGOWAN. No, the activities of your committee.

Mr. JACKSON. I would suggest that the witness is being given every opportunity to express himself, but that his answer is not in any way responsive to the question asked by counsel, and I think it is time to get an answer from the witness, as to whether he proposes to answer the question or not.

Mr. MCGOWAN. It is obvious that I will not answer questions dealing with association, with ideas.

Mr. JACKSON. This is obvious, we understand this. Do you decline to answer?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. On the first and fifth amendments?

Mr. MCGOWAN. Yes, that's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. No further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I can't understand. You make a long statement of reasoning, but then later you add the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. MCGOWAN. One can have several reasons for not answering questions of this kind. I can state a number of reasons.

Mr. JACKSON. You have already stated a number of reasons. You have stated the most pertinent one in exercising your constitutional privileges.

I ask the witness be excused.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William Wallace Norton, Jr.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NORTON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM WALLACE NORTON, JR., ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, A. L. WIRIN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. NORTON. My name is William Wallace Norton.

I would like to know what the charges are against me.

Mr. TAVENNER. There are no charges against you.

Mr. NORTON. Well, sir——

Mr. TAVENNER. You have been subpenaed here because the committee was informed that you are in possession of some facts which it desires to hear.

Mr. NORTON. In other words, I am not charged with a crime or you have not presumed that I am guilty of anything; is that true?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, you are not charged with any crime.

Mr. NORTON. And you presume I am innocent?

Mr. TAVENNER. Innocent of what?

Mr. NORTON. Well, whatever this entire—circus is about.

Mr. WIRIN. May we have order?

Mr. JACKSON. There is no presumption—excuse me for a moment, Mr. Wirin—I don't know how long you have contemplated this opening attack. There is no presumption on my part of anything—just a moment——

Mr. NORTON. Considerable pressure of something.

Mr. JACKSON. Just a minute, please. There is no presumption on my part: certainly, I know of no charges against you.

Mr. NORTON. I am happy to hear that.

Mr. JACKSON. I have not conferred with the staff as to your appearance or as to any allegation that might possibly have been made under oath by others. You are starting from scratch, Mr. Witness, and your conduct on the stand will demonstrate to what extent you yourself may feel that some charges are properly laid against you.

So far as I am concerned, there are no charges pending.

Mr. NORTON. Thank you very much, sir. I am happy to have the Congress of the United States make an announcement of my innocence.

Mr. JACKSON. Just a moment. We find you neither guilty nor innocent of anything.

Now, let's go on from there, Mr. Counsel. Will you ask questions which may tend to clarify this matter, and let whatever assumptions may be drawn be drawn. I have drawn none to this time.

Mr. WIRIN. Mr. Chairman, would you instruct persons not to engage in laughter, whether it comes from counsel table or anywhere else?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes. We have made that announcement before. Will those in the hearing room conduct themselves in a dignified way so as not to make audible sounds or any interference by laughter or remarks concerning the witness or the hearing?

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. NORTON. Pardon?

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. NORTON. May I tell Mr. Moulder, as the chairman of the committee, that this is very serious business, and I intend no laughter and I didn't have any such motives in view. I am an ordinary sort of man, and I am attempting as best I can to clear this thing through and state my purpose, and I certainly would agree that laughter has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MOULDER. All right. Let us proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you answer the question, please, sir? When and where were you born?

Mr. NORTON. I was born in Ogden, Utah, the Mormon country, in 1925.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noticed that you are accompanied by counsel.

Mr. WIRIN. I don't want to go ignored completely.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have never been guilty of ignoring you.

Mr. WIRIN. Completely, I said.

Mr. TAVENNER. No, not to any extent.

Mr. MOULDER. Counsel will identify himself.

Mr. WIRIN. A. L. Wirin, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mr. NORTON. I reside in Encino here in Los Angeles County.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident here in California?

Mr. NORTON. Since 1935, when my parents came here from Utah.

Mr. WIRIN. May I talk to the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. NORTON. Sir, I have prepared a report to the committee that lists my occupation and other pertinent facts surrounding it, and I would like to ask permission to submit this for the record of the committee, although Mr. Wheeler and the investigators of the committee know where I work, and I would like to submit this to the committee as a record of where I work.

Mr. WIRIN. May I just say to the committee that making it public might injure him in his employment. You have said again and again you have no such purpose, and you may have this information, but we would appreciate it if you do not make it public at this time.

Mr. MOULDER. May I say to you, Mr. Norton, that I have conferred with my colleague, Mr. Jackson. It is not the purpose or intent of the committee to cause any unfair publicity to yourself or is it our intention to do anything to affect your employment. These hearings are conducted in accordance with and at the direction of the Congress of the United States. The hearings are public, and what may result from your testimony in the form of publicity can't be controlled by the committee. We have no authority to do that.

Mr. WIRIN. Would you give me a word?

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask a question: As I look at this, the material that has been sent to the desk, I see only one matter which is in any way related to any reasonable fear of reprisal, and that is the one having to do with your employment.

Mr. NORTON. I included these other factors as they may be of interest to you, as further points of my background.

Mr. JACKSON. Why should your Army service or being a combat infantryman in France, Germany and Austria be in any way privileged matter?

Mr. NORTON. I don't ask for that.

Mr. JACKSON. Are there some of these he is asking and some of these he is not asking?

Mr. WIRIN. Yes. The only matter which he requests not be made public at this time is the matter of the name of his employer. Everything else—incidentally, I haven't seen the list, but this is my understanding—everything else he will testify to publicly, and you have on past occasions held executive sessions, and in other instances not disclosed information which you felt was harmful to a person. That one, single bit of information may affect him adversely in his employment. In litigation which we have had the committee has said it does not want——

Mr. MOULDER. You are proceeding along the lines or with the assumption that your testimony is going to have an unfavorable public reaction to yourself. Now, you can avoid that, of course, by being a loyal, patriotic American citizen and testifying in such a way that it will not be unfavorable to you. Your appearance before this committee in itself certainly is not any reflection upon you. We are asking you for information, and by acceding to your request here would be giving you a different consideration than has been accorded to any other witness that has ever appeared before this committee. The request is overruled.

Mr. Tavenner, proceed with your question.

Mr. WIRIN. May I look at this paper first? Mr. Moulder, no witness that I represented at these hearings has been asked as to his employment. A number of witnesses whom I represented have not been asked, so it is not true that every witness who has appeared has been asked with respect to his employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't ask him about his employment. I asked him about his occupation.

Mr. WIRIN. Inevitably——

Mr. TAVENNER. Every witness has been asked that question, as far as I know, for ten years.

Mr. MOULDER. Let us proceed in an orderly way. The question is what?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question is, What is your occupation?

Mr. WIRIN. May I confer with him for a moment?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I seldom ask for addresses and employers' names, very seldom.

Mr. MOULDER. Let us proceed. Confer with your client.

Mr. NORTON. I am a public employee in Los Angeles County.

Mr. WIRIN. That is his occupation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What character of work do you do?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that that——

Mr. MOULDER. That is a very evasive response to the question.

Mr. JACKSON. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that we can profitably pursue this matter further, except I would make an addendum that the record, as handed in by counsel, should appear in the full record of the hearings. I don't know that it will serve any purpose, Mr. Chairman, at this time by disclosing it, but I do think that if the committee accedes to his request, the information should become part of the public record.

Mr. WIRIN. I don't object to that, and this is agreeable.

Mr. JACKSON. I so request, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time.

Mr. WIRIN. I appreciate Mr. Jackson's position.

Mr. JACKSON. In the interest of time, I request that this information be incorporated as a part of the public record. I think, for the purpose of what we are trying to determine at the moment, that this is not a matter of transcendental importance.

Mr. TAVENNER. I withdraw the question.

Mr. WIRIN. Thank you.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask consent, Mr. Chairman, that this material be inserted in the transcript of the record at this point.

Mr. MOULDER. It is so ordered.

(The document above referred to is as follows:)

William Wallace Norton, Jr., 16756 Moorpark, Encino, Calif. Born September 24, 1925, Ogden, Utah. Employed as State park ranger by State of California. Presently assigned Los Encinos State Historical Monument, same address as above. Army Service No. 39716586. Combat infantryman in France, Germany, and Austria during World War II. Educated at public schools in Los Angeles since 1935. Graduated El Monte High School, attended Redlands University but did not graduate.

Mr. MOULDER. That is a very unusual proceeding. Even in court proceedings it is unusual to read into the record——

Mr. WIRIN. There are exceptions to any rule, and it is nice for you to make an exception.

Mr. JACKSON. If I felt we were going to get any appreciable amount of information from the witness, I might take a different position. I don't at the moment.

Mr. WIRIN. I think you ought to treat him the same way, if he has certain rights the Constitution gives him, whether he does or does not assert those rights. But let's argue that somewhere else.

Mr. MOULDER. Let's see how he answers the rest of these questions and reserve our decision on that until then.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say you were in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time?

Mr. NORTON. World War II.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period?

Mr. NORTON. This was from 1943 to 1945. I was in Company A of the Fifth Infantry, and we fought in France, Germany and Austria.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been?

Mr. NORTON. The public schools in Utah and here in Los Angeles, high school here, and I attended the University of Redlands for a short period of time, and I have availed myself of the public libraries.

Mr. TAVENNER. What college was that, or university?

Mr. NORTON. Redlands.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your work there?

Mr. NORTON. I didn't complete.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you stop?

Mr. NORTON. This was in 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Norton, we have heard that there are 28 different sections of the Communist Party for the Southern District of California under a revised plan, organizational plan of the Communist Party. Are you at this time a member of any one of these units of the Communist Party?

Mr. NORTON. May I ask if this is a crime, and if it is I would like to request a trial by judge and a jury, rather than a political hearing?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am certain your counsel has advised you that it is no crime.

Mr. WIRIN. I am not so sure. I am glad to have you say it, though.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not a crime. Mere membership is not a crime. The courts have so held.

Mr. NORTON. Well, thank you, sir. I am happy to have this kind of information.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, now, will you answer the question, then?

Mr. NORTON. I am going to respectfully decline to answer and decline to really be cooperative along those lines, and primarily because I am a Democrat, and my fellow Democrat, President Truman, came out here to U.C.L.A. some time ago, and, as Mr. Moulder, a fellow Missourian and Democrat certainly well knows, President Truman spoke very sharply and very strongly, so there could be no mistake, against the course of action that this committee has taken, and therefore I agree with President Truman. I don't think that good purposes are being carried out here.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you decline to answer the question, though, your agreement notwithstanding? Do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. On the grounds previously stated?

Mr. NORTON. And also on the grounds of the United States Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. What provision of the Constitution?

Mr. NORTON. Well, sir, I am not a lawyer. I am an ordinary man. I say on the basis of the United States Constitution, as I understand it. This includes all of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you relying on the provision of the fifth amendment which exempts you from testifying regarding anything that may tend to incriminate you?

Mr. NORTON. I am relying on the entire United States Constitution, and I am not going to cut it into bits and pieces and specify this portion and that portion, because I feel that this is a fairly American and fairly honest and correct thing to do. Mr. Moulder used the phrase——

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the witness' answer, I ask that you direct him to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't think you can pussyfoot with the Constitution in that manner.

Mr. WIRIN. I don't think the witness is pussyfooting.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Wirin, please.

Mr. WIRIN. He makes—all right, all right, I guess I don't have the same rights as he, of course.

Mr. NORTON. Sir, this is one of the things that I can't help feeling. This is not a court of law, and my attorney can't speak. Now, surely this means something. That is why, if I am guilty of a crime, I would like to be in a court of law where evidence is presented, and a jury and a judge hears it, but in direct reply to Mr. Moulder, I decline to answer on the grounds of the United States Constitution and on the obligations and protections that are afforded to me as a citizen therein.

Mr. WIRIN. I submit this is invoking every privilege, including the——

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand, you are invoking and claim the protection of all the provisions of the Constitution without specifying any particular provision of it?

Mr. WIRIN. And all the privileges, too.

Mr. NORTON. All of the protections and the privileges and the obligations of the United States Constitution.

Mr. WIRIN. There is something new all the time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps we have allowed the distinguished counsel representing the present witness as much latitude as we have allowed any counsel ever appearing before this committee. I say this with no animosity whatever. But I am sure that the gentleman has a full knowledge of the rules of procedure of the committee, which confines counsel to advising his client and advising him only, not to engage in debate or suggestions or asides over and above and beyond that function of advice.

I would certainly hope that counsel would abide by the rules of the committee. I think the committee has treated him and his clients with courtesy and consideration. Perhaps he might not agree. But I would certainly hope that counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union would confine himself to advice to his client.

Mr. MOULDER. That is correct, Mr. Wirin, and may I say, too, that we are trying to conduct hearings in a very dignified, orderly manner. However, in view of your statement and statements made by counsel, I am inclined to believe that you are using a very clever technique to embarrass, ridicule and to degrade this committee; and in response to your question or statement a while ago about former President Truman, I want to say that he did criticize the committee, but was referring to the conduct of it many years ago, when it probably was justly subject to some criticism. But he had no reference whatsoever to the present membership or the manner in which the

committee hearings are now being conducted. I made this very clear upon the floor of the House.

I also want to say this to you, you also said that you were a Democrat. Now, if you are a Democrat you should have no hesitancy in denying your affiliation or connection with the Communist Party, if any you have.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. WIRIN. May I speak to my client, please, a moment?

Mr. MOULDER. I want to add this: There are many members of the Communist Party who have claimed and actually registered as Republicans and also as Democrats in order to purposely embarrass both major political parties.

Proceed with your question.

Mr. NORTON. Sir, may I say a short thing in relation to President Truman?

Mr. MOULDER. No. We don't wish to carry on any continual argument here.

Mr. NORTON. It is not argument.

Mr. MOULDER. We are seeking information which we think you can give to us if you will.

Mr. NORTON. I just want to say——

Mr. MOULDER. What is the question?

Mr. NORTON. Counsel was not aware of this, and it does not represent his view. That's all I wish to say.

Mr. WIRIN. I knew nothing about it.

Mr. NORTON. He knew nothing about it.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Norton, we understand that the Venice Club of the Communist Party is within one of these areas which I spoke of, the Western Section of the Communist Party. Were you transferred to that club, the Venice Club, in 1954 as a member of that club?

Mr. NORTON. Sir, I read very carefully the statement of the committee, and I would like to make this offer, that I would be very happy to write a 20,000 word research paper.

Mr. TAVENNER. You can answer it in just three words. We don't need 20,000 to get that answer.

Mr. NORTON. Well, in that case, if I can't offer such a full explanation of what my opinions or views or knowledge may be of the subject matter contained here, if I can't offer that to the committee so they may publish it in the Congressional Record, if they like, or whatever, then on the basis of the procedure and the fact that this is not a courtroom, I choose to continue to say that I decline to cooperate or to answer, and I do this on the basis of the Constitution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I will make a proposal to the witness. He says if he can have 20,000 words in which to explain his answer, after he gives it, he might give it. I suggest that, although time is short, I am willing, if he will answer the question "Yes" or "No" to listen to 20,000 words in explanation of an unequivocal answer to the pending question.

Mr. NORTON. I am sorry. I didn't make it clear. I apologize. I wanted to do a research paper and write on this subject. I would research the matter as efficiently as I would be capable of and write 20,000 words on the history of radicalism in the United States and in Los Angeles County.

Mr. JACKSON. This was not the question. You were asked whether you were a member of the Venice Club. This is not a matter of the history of anything. Were you or were you not a member of the Venice Club of the Western Section of the Communist Party in Southern California?

Mr. NORTON. Then on the basis of the purposes and activities of the committee, in contrast to the United States Constitution, I claim all of the privileges and the obligations contained therein and respectfully decline to answer.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Including the provisions of the fifth amendment, in regard to immunity, your privilege not to testify to any matter which may tend to incriminate you?

Mr. NORTON. Sir, I haven't had your many years of legal experience, and I am not a Philadelphia lawyer, but I don't intend to cut the Constitution into bits and pieces. I am satisfied with the courts and with American justice, to say that I make this statement respectfully on the basis of the entire United States Constitution, and as an ordinary citizen I have confidence that the courts and the justice of this country will recognize that as a clear and sensible thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. The courts have been perfectly plain in the matter that the witness must be just as plain in invoking the fifth amendment as the committee must be in directing him as to the subject matter of his inquiry. But I think the witness fully understands it. I am willing to let it go at that.

Mr. NORTON. I certainly don't exclude any of the amendments, any of the words, any of the privileges or protections or obligations contained in the supreme law of the land, the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Jackson, do you have any questions?

Mr. JACKSON. No, I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. NORTON. Thank you for your kind and cooperative attitude. It wasn't nearly as bad as I had feared.

Mr. JACKSON. That is frequently the case.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Mark Sink. Will you come forward, please?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. At this time may I make a request of the same nature that I made yesterday, and that is to the effect that these hearings be held in executive session, and that this witness not be subjected to a public hearing, and further that no photographs be taken of this witness during his testimony.

Mr. MOULDER. The second request will be granted. Photographers will not be permitted to take pictures during the course of the witness' testimony. The first request is denied.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Before there is a ruling on the first one, may I call to the attention of the Chair that with regard to the executive sessions it is my understanding that there will be such sessions tomorrow, and that, as a matter of fact, this witness ought to be entitled, upon a request, to have that courtesy and that right extended to him, and we press that, Mr. Chairman, that request at this time.

Mr. MOULDER. That is for the committee to decide, and we have already made our decision.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SINK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MARK EUGENE SINK, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ROSE S. ROSENBERG

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, Mr. Sink?

Mr. SINK. Mark Eugene Sink.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify herself for the record?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Rose S. Rosenberg.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Sink?

Mr. SINK. I was born in 1920 in the State of Indiana.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. SINK. In Santa Monica, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mr. SINK. Since 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, your educational background, a brief statement?

Mr. SINK. I received a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree from Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1942. I have completed two years at Santa Monica City College, and I have completed one month at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete that one month?

Mr. SINK. As of today.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has learned of the existence of 28 units of the Communist Party comprising the Southern California District of the Communist Party. We have received testimony that there is a club of the Communist Party at Santa Monica at this time, constituting one of those 28 units. Are you a member of that unit of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. SINK. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you have ever been in the underground of the Communist Party in this area? Were you ever assigned to an underground unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. SINK. I decline to answer that question on the same basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party in this area as long ago as 1950?

Mr. SINK. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean continuously since that period of time?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, I didn't ask him that. But I probably should.

Have you been a member of the Communist Party continuously since 1950?

Mr. SINK. Again, I decline to answer any questions as to my beliefs or my political activities or any organizations that I may have been affiliated with on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask this: Do you consider the Communist Party, as it exists in this country, a political party?

Mr. SINK. Are you asking my opinion?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. SINK. I decline to discuss my opinions with anyone on this committee at this time or at any other time.

Mr. MOULDER. How can you take the position that you decline to answer questions on the basis that you have the right to keep your political affiliations secret and that we have no right to delve into it or ask you questions concerning it, if you also take the position that you can not tell us whether or not the Communist Party is a political party. It seems rather inconsistent. You can't take both sides of that.

Mr. SINK. I choose to claim the protection of the first and fifth amendments on this question at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON. I have one question only. Do you consider the annual drive to raise funds to combat cancer to be a desirable thing or not?

Mr. SINK. It was my understanding that the committee was after facts and not opinions. Are you asking me my opinion on this matter?

Mr. JACKSON. I am simply testing your good faith in the use of the amendments which you have invoked.

Mr. SINK. If you have a question, please state it to me as a question.

Mr. JACKSON. I have stated to you, do you consider that this is a good thing, to raise funds for the drive against cancer?

Mr. SINK. As I have stated, I do not choose to discuss any of my personal opinions with you in this forum.

Mr. JACKSON. You decline to answer the question?

Mr. SINK. I have declined to discuss my opinions with you in this forum.

Mr. JACKSON. And you decline to answer the question? There is a question pending.

Mr. SINK. May I ask the pertinency of this question?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, testing your good faith with reference to the use of the amendments to the Constitution which you have invoked.

I will withdraw the question.

Let me put it in a different way: Are you a member of the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. SINK. I decline to answer that on the basis of the first and fifth, also.

Mr. JACKSON. Are you a member of the Y.M.C.A.?

Mr. SINK. I would like to ask the pertinency of this question?

Mr. JACKSON. To test your good faith in taking the constitutional provisions.

Mr. SINK. I decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you seriously contend that to give me a truthful answer as to whether you are a member of the Y.M.C.A. would tend to make you liable to criminal prosecution?

Mr. SINK. I can only claim my constitutional privileges as guaranteed me in respect to any organizations, which I may or may not have belonged to.

Mr. JACKSON. I will take respectful difference with you and say that to use the constitutional prerogatives in answer to whether or not you are a Boy Scout is a violation of every concept of the fifth amendment I have ever heard.

Mr. SINK. I consider that in this forum it is dangerous to discuss any affiliation or any association of any kind.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you believe if you were to tell me that you were an athletic instructor, a member of the Y.M.C.A., it would lay you open to prosecution on a criminal charge?

Mr. SINK. If this question is not pertinent, there is no reason for me to answer this question.

Mr. JACKSON. One of the most pertinent questions I have asked today, because I want to find out——

Mr. SINK. I haven't finished, please.

Mr. JACKSON. Go ahead.

Mr. SINK. If this question is not pertinent, then, of course, I am not required to answer. But if it is pertinent then I claim the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. I consider it very pertinent. I consider it pertinent inasmuch as it relates to the good faith in which you invoke the provisions of the fifth amendment.

The fifth amendment provides that no one shall be required to give testimony against himself which may result in a criminal action against him or place him in jeopardy.

When you refuse to answer my question as to whether or not you are a member of the Y.M.C.A., the Young Men's Christian Association, and you invoke the fifth amendment, it is like a schoolchild taking the fifth amendment after breaking a window in the schoolhouse. It is not, I contend, taken in good faith, and it is very relevant and very pertinent to ask you this question.

Mr. SINK. You are raising questions which I, inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, I cannot discuss. I would like the privilege of my lawyer to present this point of view.

Mr. JACKSON. No. I am asking you a question. Your counsel has every right to advise you, as your counsel knows. She has represented a great many witnesses before this committee. You can, of course, persist in your declination to answer whether or not you are a member of the Y.M.C.A. by invoking the provisions of the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution. Invocations of this kind before a Senate Committee and House Committee and school boards and other authorities throughout this country have served to bring a great amendment into very low repute.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jack Burstein.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BURSTEIN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES "JACK" BURSTEIN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, A. L. WIRIN

Mr. WIRIN. This witness is quite deaf in his left ear.

Mr. MOULDER. So am I.

Mr. WIRIN. You don't have to sit as close to me as he does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. BURSTEIN. James Burstein.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself?

Mr. WIRIN. A. L. Wirin. This is my last witness this afternoon.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Burstein?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Detroit, Mich., October 18, 1916.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Since 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Liquor clerk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what your educational training has been?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Yes, grammar school, high school, and 3 years of college.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has been undertaking to determine what present activities of the rejuvenated Communist Party are in Southern California. We have learned of the existence of 28 units of the Communist Party, apparently, tightly organized; and preparatory to our asking you questions regarding the activities of these units, I want to ask you, first, whether or not you are a member of one of them.

Mr. BURSTEIN. I decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party, of any unit?

Mr. BURSTEIN. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BURSTEIN. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is quite apparent, Mr. Chairman, there is no use asking him questions if he refuses to answer regarding his membership.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. WIRIN. May I be excused, too?

Mr. MOULDER. You are excused, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have five minutes?

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Short recess taken.)

Mr. MOULDER. The next, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Adele Silva, will you take the stand, please?

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. SILVA. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ADELE KRONICK SILVA

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Silva, will you state your name, please?

Mrs. SILVA. My name is Adele Kronick Silva.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside, Mrs. Silva?

Mrs. SILVA. Oakland, Calif.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes; I have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time were you a member?

Mrs. SILVA. I was a member of the Communist Party part of the year of 1949 and most of the year of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reason for joining the Communist Party, how did it happen that you did?

Mrs. SILVA. The reason for joining the Communist Party started some time in the year 1948. At that time I lived in the Territory of Hawaii and the Communists, through the I.L.W.U. and groups in the Territory there, were infiltrating into all different political organizations, and I was a member of one of the organizations they infiltrated and worked very arduously to keep them out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you confer with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in regard to the matter?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did. I and my brother were both in Hawaii in 1948. We continued on with our work. We were going to get the fate that Hitler got, and I relayed this message to the F.B.I.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, during the period of time that you were actually in the Communist Party, were you there at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I was, and at my request. I wondered how I could get in to help my country.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us a little more in detail what led up to your becoming a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. SILVA. Well, I spoke to the F.B.I. and joined other organizations in Hawaii and found that the work that was being done was at the time somewhat ineffective, not in the F.B.I., but in the organizations. No one felt the need. Possibly I was young and these people talked to me; my brother was interested in his country, his Nation, and he felt the need, too. So, in talking to the F.B.I., they checked into my background and my family, and they thought that I might be able to follow my inclination to want to help, and I made a roundabout turn and went into the Communist Party in Hawaii, the Hawaiian Civil Liberties Committee, and became a hard-working member in that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you asked to become associated with some of the prominent Communists in Hawaii?

Mrs. SILVA. Oh, yes. I not only was asked, but I was very much accepted by them.

I felt that I had intimate conversations and intimate contacts with Mr. Jack Hall, Harriet Bouslog, Myer Symonds, friends of mine. I am not pointing them out as Communists, because I was never at a Communist meeting with Harriet Bouslog or Myer Symonds, but they were representatives of the Communist group.

Mr. TAVENNER. As to Harriet Bouslog, she has been identified to this committee by a number of witnesses as having been a member of the Communist Party and having served on a lobbying committee in Congress on behalf of the Communist Party.

Mrs. SILVA. From her activity I presumed that she had been, but I could not have said it because I have not been with her.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about Adele Kensinger?

Mrs. SILVA. She was a Communist and wanted me to join the Communist Party when I came to California.

Dr. Reinecke gave me letters of introduction to prominent Communists in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Reinecke, we understood very well from our investigation conducted in Hawaii in 1950, was ousted as a professor at the university there because of his Communist Party activities.

Mrs. SILVA. I don't believe, sir, it was only his activities. To my knowledge, he conducted schools all through the Territory on Marxism and communism and was using the school system in Hawaii, and not making any—he wasn't embarrassed by doing it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you received letters of introduction from him?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did, and pictures taken of him with various Communists in the Territory. So I came on to Los Angeles, where I had lived, where I had a home, Hollywood section. I felt my work would be more effectual if I came on here.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you came here armed with letters of introduction from the leading Communist in Hawaii?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, and was told who to call. If I didn't have letters, I was told who to contact; and I had become acquainted with Celeste Strack, who was an educational director of the Communist Party in the Territory of Hawaii, and went to many social affairs with Dr. Reinecke when she was there.

She told me when I came to San Francisco to contact her for instructions.

I went to San Francisco and contacted her, and she told me the steps to take to get into the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, just tell the committee, please, what you did in Los Angeles.

Mrs. SILVA. Well, I came to Los Angeles, and apparently the message hadn't come from Celeste because she had gone to New York, as she said, to a trial, and I contacted a lady who she said to call and help her out, Marva Bovingdon of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the name?

Mrs. SILVA. Bovingdon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the last name.

Mrs. SILVA. I believe it is B-o-v-i-n-g-d-o-n. Her husband's name is John Bovingdon. And I contacted her. I contacted Lillian Ripps, of the California Labor School.

Mr. TAVENNER. Lillian Ripps of the California Labor School, who was an intimate friend of Celeste Strack?

What is her name, will you spell it, please?

Mrs. SILVA. R-i-p-p-s. Shall I go on?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; proceed.

Mrs. SILVA. I did some work for the Civil Rights Congress. I didn't feel that I could do much for them; I wasn't very well acquainted with them.

Lillian Ripps in the California Labor School wanted all of the help that seemed to be possible to get, and I became acquainted with Mr. Hicks and Dr. Goldner.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is Mr. Hicks' first name?

Mrs. SILVA. Julian Hicks, and Dr. Sanford Goldner, California Labor School. He is a director, and also an instructor at the California Labor School of Jewish Studies, which they were starting in the Wilshire district in Los Angeles.

Mr. JACKSON. The individuals you mentioned were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SILVA. I knew them to be friends of the people who were Communists in Hawaii. However, at that time I did not say that. Nor did it become known they were Communists until sometime later when we got to know each other better.

Mr. JACKSON. Subsequently you determined that they were both members of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The point I make is that we want to be extremely careful in the use of names, unless you knew them to be members of the Communist Party, out of your own knowledge.

Mrs. SILVA. In that area, sir, early this morning I sat down and wrote down from memory those people whom I had met. I said to myself, were they there or weren't they there. Did they say something to you that you could still remember that would be important enough to relate to this committee, and these are the only facts I intend to present today, and nothing more.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you just proceed, please, with what took place after beginning to do various types of work here in Los Angeles?

Mrs. SILVA. Well, I was active, somewhat active at the California Labor School. At that time they were on West Eighth Street, upstairs from the Progressive Book Store, and I was starting to study some communism or the things that they had to say, and I was in the bookstore quite a good deal and had occasion, during that time, to have a cup of coffee or a sandwich downstairs with Miss Ripps or Mr. Hicks.

They had meetings and lectures. I took several of their courses. In fact, I took courses for about a year with them, and one day—of course, my whole purpose was, I hardly could believe these people were actually Communists at this point. I heard Celeste Strack say she was a Communist and bragged about it before people.

I heard Jack Hall say that he was going to the Red and would stay Red all of his life. But it was difficult to believe that these people, who had good things, were Communists.

I thought Communists were not these kind of fellows. So I would sit with these people and talk with them.

So I, by that time, had become acquainted with the man in the bookstore, the Progressive Book Store. His name was Hank Morley.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hank?

Mrs. SILVA. Morley, M-o-r-l-e-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Oh, Morley.

Mrs. SILVA. I went there. He gave me a card, and I signed the card, gave him my address and my phone number, and he said that someone would be in touch with me.

Several days went by, and one evening, unannounced, several men came to my door with a lady. They came in, they walked around my house, took quite an appraisal of it, and they instructed me to be

at a meeting of the Independent Progressive Party that evening at the home of a Sylvia Blankfort.

Mr. JACKSON. Where were you living, where was your home at this time?

Mrs. SILVA. My home was at 1435½ North Crescent Heights Boulevard in Hollywood. That was up near the Strip.

So I went to the home of the Blankforts, and one of these gentlemen asked me for fifty cents for my dues, the party dues, and the other one asked me how it felt to be a Communist.

Of course, I said, "I feel no different than I ever felt before. I have always been one of you."

I stayed at the meeting and they drove me—it was only a block, but they took me home, and they told me to be at the home of Milton Konove up in the Woodrow Wilson Heights.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name, please.

Mrs. SILVA. K-o-n-o-v-e. On Saturday night, and I went to this home. It was a party; to my knowledge at the time, it wasn't a party meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was or was not?

Mrs. SILVA. No; it was a gathering of party functionaries.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's stop there just a moment. Did you know that person to be a member of the Communist Party at that time, or did you learn later?

Mrs. SILVA. No. He was the gentleman who came to my house and took the money for the party dues.

And at this home was a Mr. Emil Freed, and he spoke about his time, being in prison for being a Communist; and they all spoke of their experiences with the law and with law enforcement.

And I came on home with a lady I had gone up with, and I was told to be at a meeting on Wednesday night, and that would be my party night—the night to be at my club meeting.

On Wednesday night, Wednesday evening, Mr. Konove stopped by my house and told me just where the meeting would be, and I went over there. It was quite close to where I lived. It was the home of Ben and Penny Rinaldo, at the meeting house project in the Wilshire district.

It seems I came in at a time when the full club was being reorganized, new members were coming in, some were being switched and some were being sent into other territories, into other work; and I became a member of the Theodore Dreiser Club of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Theodore Dreiser Club?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell me what type of work that club was engaged in at that time?

Mrs. SILVA. At that time they were—I would say that they were re-forming their club, although I later found out that they were continually re-forming the club for new action and new activity.

I was put into a split part of the club which was a cell, as I know it to be now and shortly thereafter, and our activity was developed as to what the orders were in the party, what articles we were to read—Mainstream, what the People's World was writing about, all these things were correlated by our educational director—so they worked in many and various things and continually.

Mr. TAVENNER. What assignments, if any, were given the Communist Party members in addition to that?

Mrs. SILVA. In addition to that, I would say I could go along with this gentleman who testified before lunch today. He said that he considered, or I believe he meant to say that he considered working for the People's World was part of his mass organizational work, and such it was, as a Communist member myself. Coming to the meeting was expected. It was expected of me because I had been a member at large. I was not a professional who seemed to be relieved from coming to the meetings. Selling the People's World, getting subscriptions was expected. We reported continually on the subscriptions we sold, who we sold them to. Buying literature was expected.

It was brought to the club in boxes this size, and a good member bought it and read it and studied it.

These were all the things that you just did, without doing anything else.

Then, on top of that, there were committees continually being formed, committees to do various types of things to further these aims that were being laid down by top echelons of the party, coming through the literature, which was then decided, how to activate it by the section organizers and the section educational directors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did various members of the party go out into mass organizations to carry out their duties?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes. There was a time in the early part of 1950—and I recall this meeting most specifically, it was a meeting called by Mr. Rinaldo himself. He was the president or the chairman, the top commandant of our particular part. All of the members—not just the cell that I was in, maybe eight or nine people and myself—but members from the Dreiser Club, which maybe were 25 or 30, and he took us to task for the things that were not being done, the things that had to be done, and we all sat and had a round-table discussion and told what we were doing, what organizations we were in, what effect we were having in these organizations, and this was every member of the club that was present.

There were a few members not present at the time, but it was understood so-and-so wasn't there; he is at his organization. He won't be here tonight. His organization is having a meeting, not the Communist organization, the front organization that he was working with.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then was it the understanding that each member should go out and do a particular work in mass organizations?

Mrs. SILVA. This was part of the program, and it was laid down very strictly by our chairman and by our educational director that the party had to get busy and do this kind of work, that they weren't doing enough of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, it is important for us to understand just what character of work these members were doing, that is, in what organizations they were working and how they got into them, or any information that you can give us as to that type of objective of the Communist Party, and, in telling us about that, give us the names of any persons that you know were engaged in any particular assignment of that character.

Mrs. SILVA. Well, Mr. Tavenner, that would have covered over a year. I know that I could talk on and on and on for days as to what these people did and what they were doing.

So I this morning—if the committee doesn't mind—I wrote down one organization which was just shocking to me as an individual, what was being done and how they organized this one organization. If you wouldn't mind, it would help me if I could kind of go along with my notes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Surely.

Mrs. SILVA. One reason why this was shocking to me, because, as a Jewess, I was sent in to organize a group of Jewish people. We were using Jewish organizations, innocent organizations, fine organizations, which I knew over the history of my entire family we had supported, that were not Communist, knew one to have been a beneficial society at one time, helping people out of work, who were sick; and when I sat at the meeting and found out, as time went on, that all of these different comrades had to tell what clubs they were in, what they were doing, and for that purpose, it was so shocking and traumatic to me that I have never forgotten it.

I have put it down here, member to member, and then I could tell you about how we were taught and had to go into these clubs and what we did to organize one organization alone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very good.

Mrs. SILVA. All right, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SILVA. In the club there was a young lady named Penny Rinaldo.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps you had better spell these names for the reporter.

Mrs. SILVA. P-e-n-n-y R-i-n-a-l-d-o and Ben Rinaldo. He seemed to be the apparent chairman of the Theodore Dreiser Club. He would attend to the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council. He was at large. He would go to the different cells on Wednesday night to see how we were doing in our club meetings.

So what other attachments he had, I do not know.

There was Rose Marshall. I found that she was an instructor at the California Labor School. She was also a very vociferous member of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council. She also was going to join the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order.

There was Bessie Halpern, who was a secretary——

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name.

Mrs. SILVA. H-a-l-p-e-r-n, who was the secretary of the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order.

Now, from what I understand and what I am quite sure of, most of these organizations in a community as large as Los Angeles had branches, so these people would have been in only the branch in my neighborhood, possibly the west section of the J.P.F.O.—it might have been the east section. So I could possibly assume that if one of our comrades from Dreiser was going to the J.P.F.O. and was a secretary there, that practically every J.P.F.O. officer who had been with the Communist Party, was working through these various organizations. But I speak for only the ones that I know out of my party who said in my presence that night this is where they were working; and

we were on the hot seat, and they came up and defended themselves and said they were doing enough work.

There is Morris Anatole, who was head of a Jewish veterans group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name, please.

Mrs. SILVA. I believe it is A-n-a-t-o-l-e or A-n-o-t-o-l-e. It was Anatole.

There was Jessie Carufo. Her husband was an organizer in the aircraft industry.

There was Ruth Offer, who was attached to the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council.

There was Fargo, who was freed from the meetings; he came maybe once in two months just to say hello, because he was working strictly within the Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order.

There was Irene Hyer, the choral group, I guess we would call that, of the California Labor School.

Sylvia Blankfort, Independent Progressive Party.

There was a young man whose name was Hal. I don't remember his last name—Daily People's World.

A girl named Deborah Weinberg, Jewish Hadassah, Congress of Jewish Women; she was affiliated with that.

There was a Ruth Slade, who was touring Europe. I didn't know what her affiliation was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling?

Mrs. SILVA. S-l-a-d-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand these were all members of the Dreiser Club of the Communist Party?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, each one was.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period did you help create any Communist Party group or front organization?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this particular period?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were a member of the Dreiser Club?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us about that, please?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes. I helped to organize and create the West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany, and this was done by a call to my home by Milton Konove, who was the section organizer of the Communist Party, Westside Section of Los Angeles.

The purpose was, following up these meetings, following up articles that were in the People's World and New Masses that the party was not doing effective work within the Jewish groups, as effective as the party wished done.

So it was decided to organize clubs which would interest the Jewish people.

As a Jewess, I know that the Jewish people get somewhat shook up when they hear the word "naziism," or all of these things. And they used this particular thing for the purpose of using the emotions of the Jewish people to get them involved into their organizations.

Now, it was my belief that they didn't want them all as Communists, but in going into the groups they were able to get their labors, their efforts, their propaganda over, and to get their money, to get their dues from them. The J.P.F.O. would give so much of their dues to

their officers who were Communists to buy tickets and to give subscriptions. They did this in the West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany.

So Mr. Konove told me that I would be relieved from my work in the party, going to meetings, while I worked on getting this committee headed up and started.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you would say the accomplishment of that group was to tap sources of revenue that otherwise wouldn't be available to the Communist Party, as well as to form a ground for recruiting members in the Communist Party?

Mrs. SILVA. Exactly.

Mr. JACKSON. During this time you were making reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I was.

Mr. JACKSON. With what frequency did you send your reports?

Mrs. SILVA. Well, when I had something that I thought was important, that I thought should be known, I would get it to them immediately—sometimes the next day or a couple of days after, whenever time permitted me to, I would have my report and deliver it to them.

Mr. JACKSON. Were you concurrently, while you were working for the Bureau, working in any other occupation?

Mrs. SILVA. Oh, yes. I was working as a bookkeeper. I was not a full-time employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. JACKSON. I had meant to pursue this a little more. We hear a lot about paid informers and hirelings. To what extent did the Bureau help you meet expenses? Did you get rich working for the Bureau?

Mrs. SILVA. Well, Congressman, I will say this: If I didn't work, or when I was ill if I didn't have a small income from a little home that I owned, and hadn't been able to subsidize myself, believe me, for the mass of the Communist Party—because they thought I had a little something—I could never have pursued my work. I knew that I took my resources at times; I couldn't go to the Bureau and say, "I want money for this," and "I want money for that." They would say to me, "We just can't believe that, $25.00 to give to the Civil Rights Congress."

I said, "Yes, but they told me they wanted fifty."

I went to dinners at Ciro's, the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. I had to buy clothes like these other people were wearing, dress just as well as they did. The members of my party, they lived better than I, all of them. I was within their group, and I tried to even keep up to their social standards, and it was very difficult for a working girl to do that.

Mr. JACKSON. You were traveling in pretty high-class company around Beverly Hills. Where were the Beverly Hills meetings held?

Mrs. SILVA. When we got together to form the West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany, we met at a person's swimming pool. The maid served cocktails, a colored maid.

Mr. JACKSON. Cocktails served by a maid beside a swimming pool at a Communist Party meeting?

Mrs. SILVA. While the comrades were meeting to form something to involve the Jews.

Mr. JACKSON. This is the proletariat revolution brought right down to cases. How many attended this meeting?

Mrs. SILVA. The first meeting, there were about five of us; this man's home, the next meeting, there were ten.

Mr. JACKSON. Beside the swimming pool?

Mrs. SILVA. No. The first meeting was beside the swimming pool. The next meeting was in the home.

Mr. JACKSON. In the same place?

Mrs. SILVA. In the same home, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. There were servants working in the home where the party was?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, served dinner; at one affair there was a cocktail party given for Dr. Howard Selsam, who was the educational director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name?

Mrs. SILVA. S-e-l-s-a-m, given by a gentleman for Howard Selsam, who was the educational director of the Jefferson School of Social Science.

This was for donations to keep the California Labor School in business.

There was a party at his home, and he had hired a bartender for the cocktail party given at his private home; I believe it is on June Street, in the very exclusive Wilshire neighborhood.

Mr. JACKSON. These affairs were for the purpose of raising funds for various Communist——

Mrs. SILVA. At times. This was to raise funds for the California Labor School.

Mr. JACKSON. They charged for various——

Mrs. SILVA. There were donations, and they charged, I think it was $5 or $7.50 for the ticket.

Mr. JACKSON. To go in?

Mrs. SILVA. To the dinner, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Any other charges while you were there?

Mrs. SILVA. There were donations at every meeting, mass meeting, organizational meeting, except the time at the party meeting. They didn't ask us for money at the meeting. The hat was always passed. Many a time I passed the hat myself.

Mr. JACKSON. This was pretty expensive company for you to keep up with, wasn't it?

Mrs. SILVA. It was, it certainly was. I was quite shocked; in fact, it was a shocking experience to find that they were exploiting the working people. They were exploiting the Jewish people. They were exploiting the Negro people, talking from both sides of their faces, and yet they were living in the very laps of luxury.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the Dreiser Club?

Mrs. SILVA. I remained a member of the Dreiser Club until September of 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you transferred then to another club?

Mrs. SILVA. No. I went up North. My mother had passed away. My family wanted me home, and I wasn't feeling too well. I found it almost impossible to keep up with my duties as a Communist, keep

in a position to support myself and to work for the Bureau, and so I thought that I had done all I possibly could and, if I did any more, it would injure my health. I talked to the Bureau and they said it would be all right; they realized that my health was suffering, because I worked day and night for the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. I should have thought the least the F.B.I. could have done would be to transfer you down to Boyle Heights where it would be a little cheaper to keep up with the "Joneskis."

Mrs. SILVA. I presume they are taking as much money out of the people in Boyle Heights as they are taking out of the people in Beverly Hills.

Mr. JACKSON. But in smaller bites.

Mrs. SILVA. I know, but it would hurt them just as much, maybe in smaller amounts; these people, most unsuspecting; they don't know where it is going.

I helped count the money that was given when they took the money in for Dr. Howard Selsam that night, and someone took five and someone took ten. There was enough taken out to pay for the hotel, the Mayflower Hotel, and the next day I spoke to Miss Ripps, and she said they gathered up $117.00. Now, she could get her wages and they could pay Sanford Goldner's wages that particular week; they had to draw against wages. This was a dinner to get the wages for the people who were running the California Labor School. They didn't care about the David Hedley memorial. They used David Hedley and all of these things to further their own needs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me go back a moment: You referred to this front organization which you helped organize, and you said there were some three or four people who came to your home where you did that work of organizing.

Mrs. SILVA. No, sir. Milton Konove came to my home. He was the section organizer. He told me—he instructed me, rather, and directed me to meet with members of the Shafran Club, the Eva Shafran Club of the Communist Party.

I was to meet at the home of Jack Flier or to call Jack Flier, whom I did know, tell him that I was calling to make a date for our first meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name Flier.

Mrs. SILVA. F-l-i-e-r, and he told me Sylvia Evanston, whom I knew, would be there—I knew that she belonged to the Shafran Club because she had already told me, meeting her at one time, that she belonged to Shafran, and she was there.

There were several, about two other people, and another lady came in.

There we started building up an organization that had no name, that had no format, but there were things that were brought in, and we decided upon a name and how to get the thing off on its feet.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, do you recall any other person whose name you have not given who participated in that?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, a Mr. Morris Linn came over there, and I recall these names because I wrote down the officers of this organization; we elected each other officers that night. There was Jack Flier, who was chairman; Morris Linn, treasurer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Linn?

Mrs. SILVA. L-i-n-n, I believe it is. I am not sure. Robert Metzger, myself, publicity chairman, and a lady named Sylvia Major was going to participate. It wasn't until the brochures were printed—I don't know if she ever got her name on there. I think it was taken off. But she brought all of the material necessary for us to use to start getting this organization off on its feet. This very same material had been circulated through the party club the week before, when I was at the Theodore Dreiser Club.

I would like to go a little bit more in detail about this committee. Would it be all right?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. SILVA. In meeting this handful of people, they were to go back—we had chosen part of a name that we wanted; we wanted to appeal to the Jewish people, particularly, the Jewish people on the west side. This was a movement through the party in New York already. It was published in the Cominform. This was somewhat of a call from the Communist Party: and we got this pilot group, each one of us, the following Monday, were to meet and bring one more person or two more people to the next meeting, and they were to be people brought out of the organization that they belonged to.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of organization?

Mrs. SILVA. I want to make this clear: It wasn't the Communist organization, because we were already sent from the Communist Party. We would have already been there. So then this would be a front organization or possibly some comrades who were in the front and active in the front.

At this next meeting, which was the home of Morris Linn—and this is one of the homes that was surrounded by a very lovely swimming pool and most comfortable—at this meeting we had somewhat of a democratic process of picking a name. It was already chosen as the West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany, and a Mr. Jack Ayeroff was there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Jack who?

Mrs. SILVA. Ayeroff. He was in the printing business. I don't recall the name of the organization that he represented.

Mr. Jack Flier was, I believe, on the Jewish Veterans Committee.

Sylvia Major was working through the Jewish Congress. That's it.

That night at that meeting Jack Flier came in and told us that he had gotten his organization, his front organization, to vote $100 to the West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany. Everyone subscribed as to what their group was going to do, that had gotten commitments. We were sent out and told to get further commitments.

This finally built itself up into a large meeting of about 200 people at the Beverly Hills Hotel, and that night it was read off to us the commitments, the amount of money. We would meet, after a meeting like this, in the group and get together; the pilot group had a social contact by this time.

Mr. JACKSON. The Communists?

Mrs. SILVA. That's right. Those who met the first time under the direction of Mr. Konove—we didn't ever have these other people with us after the meeting.

Mr. JACKSON. You wouldn't want to let them in on the fact this was a Communist operation; it would have been very foolish?

Mrs. SILVA. No. There might have been some who might have been working in these organizations that were not known as Communists.

Mr. JACKSON. Let me get this thing in context now: The Communist Party decided to start a movement or a Committee Against Renazification of Germany?

Mrs. SILVA. No. They didn't decide to start this. They were instructed to involve the Jewish people in this particular section, and how to involve them, so they thought up this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee was to be the agency by which they were to be brought in and interested in the committee, non-Communists?

Mrs. SILVA. That's right.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, Communists were to go out and get to non-Communists and bring them back in and use their persuasion to get money and sell tickets and get funds for their front organization; and it all builds up to a big meeting where there are 200 people there, the large part of whom were not Communists, but who were honestly concerned about the renazification of Germany.

After the non-Communists went home, the Communists sat down and talked about what a success it had been.

Mrs. SILVA. It was a greater success than that. It was—they were able to enlist the president—who was told to me to be the president—Mrs. Sylvia, president of Hadassah, who was sending out all of their literature for them, posted over the Hadassah's letterhead.

Mr. JACKSON. A non-Communist?

Mrs. SILVA. I don't know what she was. I cannot say. You could pick up the phone and call her direct. She might have been a Communist at large.

Mr. JACKSON. You have no knowledge as to her?

Mrs. SILVA. No, I didn't meet her, never saw the woman at any time. She never made an appearance.

Mr. JACKSON. But letters did go out over her signature on Hadassah stationery?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, yes, the mailing list and the names of all the members of the Hadassah. To belong to Hadassah, the Rotarians, let us say they belonged to the Knights of Columbus, to get something endorsed by any organization that you think a great deal of gives credence and importance to it, and it became important, so they had a mass rally. It was at the stadium near Farmers Market. I had to go up—my mother had passed away by that time. She had been very ill. I understand that there were over 2,000 people at this particular rally, and they sold tickets and took donations at this particular rally. This all started from direction from Milton Konove to get something—it came out of a directive, as I said before, of our party chairman, telling us we weren't doing what we should do with our mass organization. Here we sat in a Jewish neighborhood section and did nothing about it. And this was the ultimate end. This was what it did. I am sure that thousands of people came and heard. There was to be an annihilation of Jews—the pictures that were shown—Sylvia Major brought pictures——

Mr. TAVENNER. Sylvia who?

Mrs. SILVA. Major. That made my blood curl. We were reading again all about the Nuremberg trials. Yes, they happened under fascism. They don't happen in this country, but these were the things that were being stimulated, something that would touch the hearts and feelings of the Jewish people.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you know what disposition was made of the funds derived from the mass meeting?

Mrs. SILVA. Well, I know that some of the funds were going to Mr. Bob Kenny to help him become elected to Congress. I believe it was Congress or Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Funds from this mass meeting went into a political campaign to help in the election of a candidate for public office?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. How was this related to, or equated with, the renazification of Germany?

Mrs. SILVA. It had no relationship of any kind. It had no connection of any kind. The only connection was that this was a way to get money. There no doubt were people who wanted to get paid. Maybe the California Labor School got some of it, possibly the party got some of it. The People's World had big ads, so we could pay the People's World ads. They could get their fingers into it. This was a chance for Mr. Kenny to speak. This did all the things the party wanted done, and this——

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that the Communists got lists from some of these legitimate organizations of their membership?

Mrs. SILVA. From all of them. They had them from the Jewish Congress, from the Hadassah. They had them from the National Council of Jewish Women. They had them from some of the synagogues, from everywhere. You wondered just how they were getting them. Of course, I knew they had plants in everything. They had me planted in here, and they had the next person planted in there. They worked until they became officers, until they finally got these lists out to their friends.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suppose a lot of the members have always wondered how they happened to be getting so much literature of a certain character?

Mrs. SILVA. Probably so, and they never knew where it was coming from. They thought many times their organization was backing this. They would think it is good. They get something in the mail. It says this is good. Do this or don't do it, and they read it and go along with it, particularly if they think—well, if they are president or chairman of an organization. I know 15 years ago if I got something from an organization I belonged to, I would assume I would just do what they said; I thought this much of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said some of the money may have gone to the California Labor School. Did you have any special connection or experience with the Labor School?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like you to tell us about that, unless you have something more to say about the matter we have just been discussing.

Mrs. SILVA. Well, I don't know. I hope I have made myself clear. I have tried to explain, as I have tried before, to point out what the Communist Party club is, what a Communist-infiltrated club is, what organizations can have happen to them and has had happen to them through my experience. This was one classic example of it.

I don't know if I have made myself clear. I have tried.

Mr. JACKSON. I would say I think this is one of the clearest expositions I have ever heard of how a few dedicated people can carry out a project. Mr. Chairman, it could very well be a lesson to every American to watch his organizations a little more closely than many Americans have been prone to do in the past. I think it is an excellent exposition, and I hope that it has wide circulation when the committee hearings are published.

Too many Americans are apathetic about the use of their names and their organizations, the letterheads of their organizations, the purposes to which they lend their prestige, and I personally think this is one of the most graphic examples that I have any knowledge of, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. SILVA. You asked me about the California Labor School.

I spent some time around the California Labor School. That, again, is a whole other story. It is not a labor school; it doesn't teach a craft or didn't teach a craft or a trade. It didn't get a person a job.

It was a place where they could get out Communist propaganda. That's all I found at the Labor School.

I took a course in journalism. If I had to go out in the world and make a living from what I learned there, I could never have earned any form of a living.

They taught interpretative dancing, ceramics, for which they were getting Federal funds under the G.I. Bill of Rights, and they gave courses all with a real down-the-line left-hand deal.

While around there, I would say I was a hard-working Government agent, and learning from the Communists to work hard in an organization. I took a page out of their book and I worked hard in their organization, so I went down to the Labor School and gave them a lot of my time, filled envelopes, typed letters, and spent money on Lillian Ripps, this one and the next one, and they were very glad to have me around them. So I got to know a great deal about them.

I went to their dinners, their parties, their club meetings.

After being around there for a while, they were going to have a meeting. I was in the party by this time. They knew it, because there was a close connection between the party and the Labor School. By this time I wouldn't be addressing envelopes and being inside their inner sanctum if I weren't a Communist Party member. I was invited to an afternoon affair to be held at the home of a Mr. Hay, H-a-y. I believe it is Harry Hay. He was, if I recall properly, a musical teacher of some kind, and I was at his home for the purpose of mapping out and formulating the format for the next season's school curriculum. At this meeting with the instructors—one of the instructors was one of my comrades, Rose Marshall—at this afternoon and evening meeting, it was decided how Marxism would be taught to the people that they would get to join the California Labor School. It advertises itself as a school to help the working man. People whom I had met before and after thought it was good to help them

develop their potential in life and be able to increase their earnings. This was the thing that one would presume it was doing. From my experience it was not doing that at all. It was completely a Marxist school.

Mr. TAVENNER. May we have just a few minutes?

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will recess a few minutes.

(Short recess taken.)

Mr. JACKSON (presiding). The committee will be in order.

The witness will resume the witness stand. Mr. Moulder, the chairman of the subcommittee, has been called away on official business. The chair will be occupied for the balance of the hearings by the member from California.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of the meeting that was held which you attended, regarding the curriculum that was to be taught the succeeding year.

Mrs. SILVA. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were policies of the California Labor School generally settled or agreed upon?

Mrs. SILVA. I speak of this particular meeting for setting forth the curriculum for that term coming up. At the meeting, after dinner was served, we waited for a while, two gentlemen came in, and we all sat down, and sitting at the head of the round room, the room where we all sat around, was a Dr. Goldner, director of the school, Dr. Sanford Goldner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell that?

Mrs. SILVA. G-o-l-d-n-e-r. I have been trying to spell the names, because certainly I would not want to see anyone with a similar name be used here, because it would be a terrible thing to associate them with that.

Sanford Goldner, G-o-l-d-n-e-r.

There was Julian Hicks, there was Lillian Ripps, there was Rose Marshall, there was Silan Chan.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is that?

Mrs. SILVA. Silan Chan, I think, or Chin; C-h-a-n, I believe it could be. She was teaching interpretative dancing at the school. There was Farol, the Harbor Division of the California Labor School. That was down in Wilmington or San Pedro.

There was Harry Hay in whose home this meeting was held. There was his wife, whose first name I don't know. There was myself. Let me look at my review here and see if there were any others.

There was Marva Bovingdon, who was on the faculty, or her husband, John, who was on the faculty. John had been on the faculty before.

There was a chap named John, whose name I do not recall and a man by the name of Welanko. Sitting on the other end, all the way towards the end of Dr. Goldner, was Mr. Henry Black, who I will identify in a few moments, and a Mr. William Taylor.

Mr. JACKSON. Can you further identify Mr. Taylor?

Mrs. SILVA. I can identify him this way, that I didn't presume that these people were any such thing, but we introduced ourselves, and Dr. Goldner introduced himself. Julian said what he was, Lillian said what she was, and I said what I was, and we got around to Mr. Henry Black, and he said he was a librarian of the Jefferson School of

Social Science, and there was Mr. William Taylor, who was the educational director of the Communist Party.

Mr. JACKSON. They are not uncommon names.

Mrs. SILVA. So in round-table discussion each one talked about whether Marxism was being taught the right way, not whether it was being taught theoretically the right way, but whether it was being taught the way it was getting to the people in the school, and whether it was going to get more people in the school, how to teach it to get more people, more members.

It was whether it would be implied Marxism, implication and theory, or whether they were going to come right out and say this is Karl Marx and this is a revolutionary thing, and you are going to go after this and you are going to do this, or whether it was going to be watered down, and this was the word used, or we were going to build it up. And finally it came around to Mr. William Taylor, and he said this is what the party wants out of the school, and there was no longer any doubt in my mind that the California Labor School was a school run by the Communist Party.

Now, I don't say that this was the only school run by the Communist Party; this was the kind of a school that Joe Doe or Mary Doe—I am just using names that I hope are not existent—they wanted to get these people to the school and keep a certain front up. This is not the other school that I had started to go to as a member of the Communist Party. I went to the California Labor School and I was put as a student adviser. I am sure I was a very poor adviser to the students there, because I couldn't advise them heartfully to go to California Labor School.

While I was in the party, Mr. Morris Anatole and Milton Konove told me that they wanted me to go to the school where I would learn strategy and tactics; and from week to week, each week I was going to be told where to go, and finally one dusky evening I was told this is the night to go, Tuesday night, and I dropped everything. He stopped by the house and—he went to the house and let me off; he told me to walk up a block, go around the corner another block, around the corner another block, and then go to a home which had a back stairs—this sounds almost like something out of a page of fiction, but it is so—and go up the back stairs and go into this apartment, there would be a girl there, a couple of other people, and there we would have a class.

And when I got there he was already there. I went over alone, and he went alone, and this other lady was there, and a very sad part to find was Ruth Greenberg was there, and she was one of the officers, I understood to be an officer of the Pioneer Women's club. She was at this little class taking tactics and strategy.

I went to this class twice and I went home ill and very, very sick and I couldn't lend myself to it any longer, and it was just by that time that I retired from my work. I didn't want to know their strategy and I didn't want to know their tactics, because I know I could never do it; I could never be a counterspy. I was completely for my Government and my people and I just think it was terrible. So I didn't pursue it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you leave then and go to San Francisco?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes, I did. I went back home to Oakland.

Mr. TAVENNER. I failed to ask you, as I usually ask witnesses, what your occupations have been. I think you have been a public accountant, haven't you?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes. I am a public accountant and after I left the party, my work at the Bureau, I wanted to further my studies, and I went to nursing school. I did nursing for a while, and now I am back doing accounting, and I might want to do nursing again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that about cover your knowledge while working for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of things that you think would be pertinent to this hearing?

Mrs. SILVA. Well, sir, I could reiterate another meeting and another group and another instruction and things that happened in Honolulu; after all, a year, when you are meeting once a week in your club and you're meeting in front organizations and you are selling the People's World, many, many things happen.

Mr. JACKSON. Counsel, I assume the witness will be available to the committee staff. The hour is getting late. Do you have any more direct questions at this time?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think we should ask her to give the benefit of that information which she just spoke of to the investigators so we may make a record of it.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. You will be willing to do that, confer with our investigator?

Mrs. SILVA. Yes. I will say this: I have not felt imposed upon, cooperating with your committee. I have been embarrassed for the people who refused to say whether they were or were not, but this is party strategy and party tactics. And I am embarrassed for those who might be of my faith who would do this in this beautiful country of ours, and I hope that they don't continue to pursue that sort of thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all.

Mr. JACKSON. You were not here yesterday. I addressed a brief statement to Mrs. Marion Miller, who appeared and who had also served, as you served, as an undercover agent within the Communist Party for a Government agency. Those of us who have served for many years on this committee have listened to considerable testimony from people who have undergone the same experiences. We know the personal sacrifice that is the lot of those who do this work. You will be berated and vilified and anathematized by the comrades because you have seen it as your patriotic duty to defend American institutions. That is the lot of anyone at any level of Government or private life, from housewife to J. Edgar Hoover, who undertakes to combat the Communist conspiracy.

However, speaking on behalf of the committee, the committee staff, and your Congress, I want to express our appreciation and say to you, as I did to Mrs. Miller yesterday, that second only to your service to your country is your service to your own people, the Jewish people, who are frequently maligned in connection with their activities in the Communist Party.

I think your act has been the act of a good American, and you leave the committee room with the best wishes of all of the members of the committee and, I am confident, the vast majority of the people in the hearing room. There may be a few exceptions, but I wouldn't worry about them. Thank you very much.

Mrs. SILVA. Thank you very much.

Mr. JACKSON. The Chair wishes to make a brief statement on the conclusion of the current hearings.

Until such time as the testimony taken during the past three days can be evaluated and analyzed, the subcommittee will not be in a position to set forth its general findings nor possible recommendations to the full committee. Nonetheless, several general conclusions can be drawn from the testimony of the witnesses who have been heard to this time.

It is apparent that the Communist operation nationally, as well as the local groupments, have undertaken a reassessment of their position and of the methods to be used in the future to achieve the ultimate goals of the Communist conspiracy. That the new emphasis on certain phases of Communist tactics has unquestionably caused dispute and dissension in the ranks of party workers and adherents, resignations from the Communist Party, as such, should not be interpreted as mass defection from Communist principles. The main stream of Communist doctrine is in no manner influenced by minor eddies and whirlpools along its edges, and the entire body of philosophy continues to move toward a world sea of Red, in spite of occasional ebb and flow in the tidal basins of Marxian philosophy.

Communists are not only dedicated fanatics, but they have perfected their techniques of confusion and frustration to near perfection. Those who have followed the course of the present hearings will recognize the continuing intransigeance of individual Communists, a characteristic which has marked the movement since its inception. Direction, tactics, techniques, and personalities may change, but the basic tenets of the movement remain immutable and dangerous to free governments and individual liberty under law.

The testimony of those witnesses who have disclosed to the subcommittee facts within their own knowledge concerning the operations of Communists, have added materially to the general knowledge possessed by the American public of the operations of the Communist movement in this country. The committee expresses its appreciation and that of the Congress to these witnesses. It expresses the hope that others who availed themselves of their constitutional privileges not to testify will, in the months or the years ahead, reassess their positions and come to a more complete recognition of what most Americans consider to be their own responsibilities as American citizens to a nation which has assumed world leadership against political, economic, and military aggression. So long as the world continues to witness Communist aggression on the move in Tibet, North Viet Nam, and on the frontiers of India, we must continue our eternal vigilance, to insure that our own institutions and those of other free men are not rendered defenseless by the machinations of the conspiracy.

The printed testimony of the present hearings will be available on request from the House Committee on Un-American Activities within the next several weeks. Those desiring copies should address their request to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

The subcommittee wishes especially to express its appreciation to the press, the radio, and television, who have given coverage to the hearings; to the U.S. Marshal and to the deputy marshals who have

been assigned to the hearing room; to the Sheriff and the deputies of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office; to the Chief of Police of Los Angeles and to the Chief of Police and the Police Department of the City of Santa Monica; to the Superintendent of Buildings and to other Federal, State, and local agencies which have made it possible to conduct these hearings; and to the audience which has cooperated with the committee.

We want especially to express our appreciation to Chief Judge Peirson Hall and to the members of his staff for their fine cooperation and for making available the Judge's chambers for the use of the committee and the staff.

The committee recognizes that the quality of its work and the effectiveness of its recommendations through the House of Representatives must be founded upon the careful and intelligent performance of duties by members of its own staff. The subcommittee commends the diligence and conscientious preliminary investigations conducted by William Wheeler, staff investigator; Donald Appell, special investigator assigned to these hearings; Mrs. William Wheeler; and Miss Patricia Donnelly.

The subcommittee also extends its appreciation to Mr. Frank Tavenner, committee counsel.

Those persons desiring to communicate any factual information regarding subversive activities within the Southern California area are encouraged to communicate those facts to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or to the House Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, D.C.

The hearings are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., Thursday, October 22, 1959, the hearings in the above-entitled matter were closed.)

INDEX

Individuals

A

Page

Alexander, Ed 1251
Allen, Adele (Mrs. Booker Van Allen; aka Van Allen) ..... 1152, 1162, 1168–1170 (testimony)
Allen, Booker Van (also known as Van Allen) 1152
Anatole, Morris 1271, 1280
Avers, Aaron 1151
Avers, Gertrude (Mrs. Aaron Avers) 1151
Ayeroff, Jack 1275

B

Baskin, Jack 1213
Baskin, Virginia (Mrs. Jack Baskin) 1213
Bessie, Daniel ..... 1127–1133 (testimony)
Black, Henry 1279
Blankfort, Sylvia 1268, 1271
Blumenkranz, Bob. (*See* Brent, Robert Duff.)
Blumenkranz, Harriet. (*See* Brent, Harriet.)
Blumenkranz, Walter Duff. (*See* Brent, Robert Duff.)
Booth, Marlowe 1151
Bouslog, Harriet 1265
Bovingdon, John 1266, 1279
Bovingdon, Marva (Mrs. John Bovingdon) 1266, 1279
Bowers, Henrietta 1151
Bowers, Noah 1151
Brent, Harriet (nee Rappaport; Mrs. Robert Duff Brent) ..... 1151, 1167, 1172, 1174–1177 (testimony)
Brent, Robert Duff (born Walter Duff Blumenkranz) ..... 1151, 1171–1174 (testimony), 1176
Brodsky, Merle 1141, 1142, 1148, 1155
Brodsky, Seymour 1148
Browder, Earl 1121
Brown, Susan 1150
Burrell, O. E 1147
Burstein, James (Jack) ..... 1152, 1187, 1263–1264 (testimony)

C

Carlisle, Harry 1202
Carufo, Jessie 1271
Ceis, Philip 1160
Chan, Silan 1279
Chernin, Rose. (*See* Kusnitz, Rose.)
Clark, Joseph 1121, 1235
Clinger, Moiselle (J.) ..... 1133–1155 (testimony), 1165, 1166–1169, 1173, 1176, 1177, 1181
Cohen, Aaron K ..... 1125–1127 (testimony)
Cohen, Daniel Francis ..... 1118–1124 (testimony)
Cohen, Kalman 1125, 1126
Connelly, Dorothy Healey. (*See* Healey, Dorothy Ray.)
Cormack, Charles 1151
Cormack, Teresa (Mrs. Charles Cormack) 1151

D

Page

Di Maria, Samuel 1183, 1184
Doran, Lillian 1198, 1202
Drummond, Elaine 1141, 1142, 1148–1150, 1153
Drummond, Gilbert (Gil) ..... 1141, 1142, 1147, 1149, 1150, 1166–1167 (testimony)
Dulles, John Foster 1121

E

Ellis, Charles 1151
Ellis, Shirley (Mrs. Charles Ellis) 1151
Epstein, Pauline 1201
Erger, Liz 1193
Evanston, Sylvia 1274

F

Fargo 1271
Farol 1279
Fenster, Leo 1118, 1127, 1162
Fleishman, Stanley 1201
Fletcher, Elizabeth 1148, 1150, 1151
Flier, Jack 1274, 1275
Fogg, Adaline 1151
Forest, Dorothy 1213
Foster, William Z 1120–1122
Frankel, J. Allan 1201
Frankel, Seymour 1201
Freed, Emil 1268
Friedman, Joe 1193, 1195

G

Gates, John 1120–1122, 1235
Geiselman, Lucia. (*See* Kres, Lucia.)
Geiselman, Paul, Jr ..... 1182–1187 (testimony)
Geiselman, Paul, Sr 1184, 1185
Gilbert, Pauline 1142
Goldberg, Murray (Julius) ..... 1149, 1150, 1162–1165 (testimony)
Goldberg, Terry (Mrs. Murray Goldberg) 1149, 1150
Goldner, Sanford 1266, 1267, 1274, 1279
Goodman, Morris 1192, 1196
Gordon, Mary 1136, 1140, 1144, 1145
Gray, William P 1155
Greenberg, Ruth 1280

H

Hall, Gus 1133
Hall, Jack 1265, 1267
Hall, Peirson (M.) 1283
Hall, Ralph (also known as Carl Swanson) ..... 1158–1162 (testimony), 1177, 1188
Halpern, Bessie 1270
Hartle, Barbara 1158, 1159
Hay, Harry 1278, 1279
Hay, Mrs. Harry 1279
Healey, Dorothy Ray (Mrs. Philip Connelly; nee Rosenblum; also known as Dorothy Ray) 1116, 1122, 1126, 1128, 1169, 1195, 1198, 1221, 1222, 1251
Hecht, Minnie 1195
Hicks, Julian 1266, 1267, 1279
Hitchcock, G. P 1251
Hoover, J. Edgar 1281
Huff, Henry 1159
Hyer, Irene 1271
Hyun, David 1199, 1202
Hyun, Peter 1199, 1202, 1204

K

Page

Kagan, Milton ---- 1179–1181 (testimony)
Kenny, Robert (W.) ---- 1277
Kensinger, Adele ---- 1266
Kessler, Mike ---- 1152
Kievits, Elsa ---- 1171
Konove, Milton ---- 1268, 1271, 1272, 1274–1276, 1280
Kranen, John F ---- 1186, 1187–1189 (testimony)
Kres, Lucia (nee Geiselman) ---- 1183, 1185
Krupin, Nathan ---- 1195
Kusnitz, Rose (nee Chernin) ---- 1198, 1199, 1202, 1205

L

Lebow, Jerome ---- 1195
Lebow, Phyllis ---- 1195–1197, 1214–1219 (testimony)
Lewis, Walter K ---- 1120
Lindesmith, Rosalind ---- 1149
Linn, Morris ---- 1274, 1275
Lipton, Lawrence ---- 1145, 1152
Ludel, Lennie ---- 1151

M

Maas, Eleanor (Mrs. William L. Maas; nee Argula) ---- 1219–1221 (testimony), 1223–1225 (testimony)
Mahaney, Wilbur Lee ---- 1184, 1185
Major, Sylvia ---- 1275–1277
Margolis, Benjamin (Ben) ---- 1158, 1187, 1250
Marshall, Rose ---- 1270, 1278, 1279
McGowan, James George ---- 1250–1253 (testimony)
McGowan, Jim ---- 1151
McGowan, Lucille (Mrs. Jim McGowan) ---- 1151
McLaughlin, Bill ---- 1151
McLaughlin, Goldie (Mrs. Bill McLaughlin) ---- 1151
McTernan, Anne Perpich ---- 1202
McTernan, Francis J ---- 1219, 1223
Metzger, Robert ---- 1275
Miller, Marion (Mrs. Paul Miller) ---- 1189–1214 (testimony), 1215, 1227, 1228, 1281
Miller, Paul ---- 1190, 1192, 1193, 1200, 1213
Mitchell, Hart ---- 1142
Morley, Hank ---- 1267

N

Norton, William Wallace, Jr ---- 1253–1260 (testimony)

O

Offer, Ruth ---- 1271
Olson, Ben. (*See* Olson, John Bennett.)
Olson, Dorothy (Mrs. John Bennett Olson; also known as Mrs. Ben Olson) ---- 1151
Olson, John Bennett (also known as Ben Olson) ---- 1145, 1151
Ornitz, Donald ---- 1221–1223 (testimony)

P

Perpich, Anne. (*See* McTernan, Anne Perpich.)
Pestana, Frank ---- 1174
Porter, John ---- 1201
Poulson, Harper (W.) ---- 1147, 1149, 1229–1250 (testimony)

R

Reinecke (John E.) ---- 1266
Rice, Craig ---- 1145
Richards, Silvia ---- 1145, 1151
Rinaldo, Ben ---- 1268–1270
Rinaldo, Penny ---- 1268, 1270

Page
Ripps, Lillian 1202, 1266, 1267, 1274, 1278, 1279
Rivers, Les 1146
Rosenberg, Ethel 1154
Rosenberg, Julius 1154
Rosenberg, Rose S. (Mrs. Sol Rosenberg) 1125, 1151, 1171, 1177, 1179, 1181, 1182, 1201, 1261
Rosenberg, Sol 1151
Rubin, William ..... 1155–1157 (testimony)
Rykoff, Richard 1201

S

Samuels, William 1201
Sanford, Charles 1251
Schack, David 1195
Schack, Nora 1195
Scharf, Ron 1151
Scharf, Mrs. Ron 1151
Schoichet, Nathan L 1221
Schulberg, Budd 1146
Schwartz, Harry 1121
Selsam, Howard 1273, 1274
Shafran, Eva 1136
Shandler, Esther 1201
Silva, Adele Kronick ..... 1264–1281 (testimony)
Sink, Mark Eugene ..... 1261–1263 (testimony)
Slade, Ruth 1271
Smith, Delphine Murphy 1191, 1192, 1198, 1202
Sniderman, Elaine (Mrs. Joe Sniderman) 1150, 1151
Sniderman, Joe ..... 1150, 1151, 1181–1182 (testimony)
Sproul, Jean Rubin 1142
Strack, Celeste 1266, 1267
Swanson, Carl. (*See* Hall, Ralph.)
Sylvia, Mrs 1276
Symonds, Myer 1265

T

Tannenbaum, Jerry 1152
Taylor, William 1279, 1280
Tenner, Jack 1201
Timofeyev, T 1121
Titleman, Elaine 1142
Tobey, Berkeley 1151
Truman (Harry S.) 1257, 1258

V

Van Allen. (*See* Allen, Booker Van.)

W

Weinberg, Deborah 1271
Welanko (Abraham) 1279
Wells, Lona ..... 1152, 1177–1179 (testimony)
White, Carl F 1182
Wilby, Celia 1142, 1146
Wildman, Leonard 1160
Wilkinson, Frank 1204
Wirin, A. L ..... 1168, 1214, 1227–1228 (statement), 1229, 1253, 1263

Y

Yanez, Josephine 1202
Young, Bill 1148

ORGANIZATIONS

A

Page
American Civil Liberties Union---- 1210, 1211, 1227, 1228
Southern California---- 1228
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born---- 1189, 1203
American Peace Crusade, Southern California Peace Crusade---- 1204
Arts, Sciences and Professions Council. (*See* National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.)

B

B'nai B'rith---- 1196
Brentwood Club---- 1213

C

California Emergency Defense Committee---- 1134, 1189, 1204
California Labor School---- 1135, 1266, 1267, 1270, 1271, 1273, 1274, 1277–1280
School of Jewish Studies---- 1267
Central Labor Council, Santa Monica---- 1148
Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms---- 1203, 1204
Civil Rights Congress (Los Angeles)---- 1191, 1204, 1266
Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. (*See* entry under National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case, Los Angeles.)
Communist Party, Hawaii---- 1265, 1266
Communist Party, Soviet Union---- 1121
Communist Party, USA:
National structure:
National Committee---- 1123
Sixteenth National Convention, February 9–12, 1957, New York City---- 1119–1122, 1130
District organization:
Southern California District---- 1116, 1122, 1126, 1221, 1231, 1251, 1257, 1261
Bay Cities Section. (*See* Western Section.)
Convention, April 13–14, 1957, Los Angeles---- 1126, 1128
District Council---- 1119, 1127, 1185, 1221, 1231
Western Section (also known as Bay Cities Section)---- 1115, 1116, 1126, 1127, 1133, 1156, 1163
Educational Committee---- 1181
Labor Club---- 1180
Santa Monica Club---- 1174, 1261
Venice Club (Venice, Calif.)---- 1160, 1177, 1188, 1259, 1260
State organization:
California:
Fresno County---- 1252
Harbor Section---- 1252
Kings County---- 1252
Los Angeles County:
County Convention, January 5–6, 1957, Los Angeles---- 1128, 1167, 1188
Eva Shafran Club---- 1274
Santa Monica, Cell Within Douglas Aircraft Co---- 1137, 1138, 1140
Theodore Dreiser Club---- 1268–1271, 1273
Western Division---- 1177, 1188
Executive Committee---- 1185
Mar Vista Club---- 1193–1195
Sixteenth Congressional District, Venice Club---- 1252, 1259, 1260
West Los Angeles Club---- 1194, 1195
Westside Section---- 1271
Tulare County---- 1252
New York State---- 1121
Bronx Section---- 1188
Washington State---- 1158
Congress of Industrial Organizations---- 1137, 1138
Congress of Jewish Women---- 1271, 1275, 1277

D

Page

Democratic Party, Los Angeles, Calif. 1143, 1144
Douglas Aircraft Co. 1134, 1137–1142

F

Fund for the Republic 1211

H

Hadassah (Los Angeles Chapter) 1271, 1276, 1277
Hawaiian Civil Liberties Committee 1265

I

Independent Progressive Party 1144, 1154, 1166, 1271
Central Committee 1167, 1178
International Association of Machinists (IAM) 1137, 1138, 1143

J

Jefferson School of Social Science 1273, 1279, 1280
Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order 1270, 1271
Jewish War Veterans of the United States 1275

L

Labor Youth League 1130
Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, International (ILWU) 1265
Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born 1154, 1189–1192, 1197–1201, 1203–1205, 1210, 1212
Steering Committee 1202
Los Angeles Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. (*See* entry under National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case.)
Los Angeles Sobell Committee. (*See* entry under National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case.)

N

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Santa Monica 1147
National Commitee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell in the Rosenberg Case 1204
Los Angeles Sobell Committee 1204
National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case:
Los Angeles Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case 1204
National Council of Jewish Women 1196, 1216, 1277
National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, Southern California Chapter 1270, 1271

P

Pioneer Women's Organization 1190, 1212, 1213, 1280
Political Prisoners Welfare Committee 1204
Progressive Book Shop (or Book Store) (Los Angeles) 1192, 1267
Progressive Youth League, Los Angeles County 1131

S

San Francisco State College 1220
School of Jewish Studies, California. (*See* entry under California Labor School.)
Southern California Peace Crusade. (*See* entry under American Peace Crusade.)

T

Thomas Jefferson Bookshop 1143, 1144
Tom Paine School of Social Science (Philadelphia) 1184

U

Page
University of California at Los Angeles 1261

W

West Side Committee Against Renazification of Germany (Los Angeles, Calif.) 1271, 1272, 1275

Y

Young Communist League, California 1251
Convention, First Annual State, Nov. 5–7, 1937, Los Angeles 1251
Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) (Los Angeles) 1196

PUBLICATIONS

Daily People's World 1244, 1247, 1248, 1269, 1277
Washington State 1160
Daily Worker 1121, 1235
Korean Independent 1197
New Frontiers 1251
Partinaya Zhizn 1121
Sovetskaya Rossiya 1121

○

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05706 3149

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.